1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	x
3	LYNWOOD D. HALL, ET UX., :
4	Petitioners : No. 10-875
5	v. :
6	UNITED STATES :
7	x
8	Washington, D.C.
9	Tuesday, November 29, 2011
10	
11	The above-entitled matter came on for oral
12	argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
13	at 10:03 a.m.
14	APPEARANCES:
15	SUSAN M. FREEMAN, ESQ., Phoenix, Arizona; for
16	Petitioners.
17	PRATIK A. SHAH, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor
18	General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; for
19	Respondent.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	SUSAN M. FREEMAN, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	PRATIK A. SHAH, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondent	27
8	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	SUSAN M. FREEMAN, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Petitioners	54
11		
12		
13	•	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(10:03 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument
4	first this morning in Case 10-875, Hall v. United
5	States.
6	Ms. Freeman.
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF SUSAN M. FREEMAN
8	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
9	MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
10	please the Court:
11	Bankruptcy estates incur taxes when they
12	generate income. The Government's attempt to limit the
13	effect of the farm sale statute, section 1222(a)(2)(A),
14	alters that fundamental principle in corporate chapter
15	11 cases and in all bankruptcy cases, as it requires
16	this Court to construe the administrative section and
17	the priority section of the Bankruptcy Code that do
18	apply in all of those cases.
19	In a chapter 12 case, the bankruptcy estate
20	consists of more than just the assets that existed as of
21	the date of filing. They also consist of all of the
22	income that is earned thereafter, wages Mrs. Hall's
23	wages as a convenience store clerk are part of the
24	bankruptcy estate the proceeds from selling crops
25	JUSTICE KENNEDY: Does it include debts 3

- 1 incurred after the filing?
- 2 MS. FREEMAN: From the period -- from the
- 3 petition filing date until the confirmation of the plan,
- 4 yes, it does. Those debts are incurred in the operation
- 5 of the estate --
- 6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Debts -- debts that were
- 7 incurred after that date?
- 8 MS. FREEMAN: Yes, Your Honor. So that, for
- 9 example, in operating an estate, you would incur a light
- 10 bill as well as incurring taxes. All of the operating
- 11 expenses are incurred by the bankruptcy estate and are
- 12 payable from the income and from the estate assets
- 13 during that period from the petition filing date until
- 14 the confirmation of the plan.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Is that true of --
- 16 MS. FREEMAN: That's the administrative
- 17 period.
- 18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Is that true of State --
- 19 you said taxes. Is it true of State taxes?
- 20 MS. FREEMAN: Yes, Your Honor, it is true of
- 21 State taxes as well as Federal taxes. County taxes, for
- 22 example. Property taxes --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: So, in this -- in this --
- 24 we're dealing with a capital gains tax on the sale of
- 25 the farm. Suppose a State had a similar tax; it also

1	taxed	the	gain	on	the	sale.	
---	-------	-----	------	----	-----	-------	--

- MS. FREEMAN: Correct, Your Honor, and it
- 3 did in this particular case. So, there would be State
- 4 taxes on the capital gains, and those would also be
- 5 administrative expense priorities, except for the farm
- 6 sale provision here, which demotes that priority if the
- 7 debtor is able to earn a discharge. And if so, then
- 8 those farm sale taxes are demoted in priority and may be
- 9 discharged under a plan of reorganization. They would
- 10 share pro rata with the other prepetition claims of the
- 11 bankruptcy estate.
- 12 JUSTICE ALITO: Who would file the State tax
- 13 return? Would it be filed by the estate or would it be
- 14 filed by the debtor?
- 15 MS. FREEMAN: The debtor and the estate are
- 16 one in a -- in a reorganization case. And so, the
- 17 taxpayers, Lynwood and Brenda Hall, would file the tax
- 18 return. The way that it would actually be administered,
- 19 Your Honor, is shown by the Knudsen case. And,
- 20 basically, there would be a tax return that includes all
- 21 of the income, the wages, the crop sale proceeds and so
- 22 forth. And then it would compute it with the capital
- 23 gains tax, and there would be a separate pro forma
- 24 return that does not include the capital gains tax.
- Those would be sent to the Special

- 1 Procedures Unit of the IRS, so that somebody there would
- 2 know how to deal with it and would be able to count the
- 3 difference.
- 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, how do you deal
- 5 with section 346?
- 6 MS. FREEMAN: Section 346, Your Honor,
- 7 basically makes the State taxes consistent with the
- 8 Federal taxes. When you have --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I read 346(b) to say
- 10 that, unless the estate is a separate tax entity under
- 11 the code, that the debtor, not the estate, pays State
- 12 and local taxes. This is totally contrary to what
- 13 you're saying, but the language of 346(b) --
- MS. FREEMAN: Your Honor --
- 15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- basically answers the
- 16 question against you with respect to State and local
- 17 taxes.
- 18 MS. FREEMAN: Justice Sotomayor, I do not
- 19 think it does, in the sense -- in this sense: The
- 20 bankruptcy -- section 346(b) made the State and local
- 21 taxes consistent with Federal taxes, and when you have a
- 22 bankruptcy estate that consists only of assets on the
- 23 petition filing date, then you have a separate taxable
- 24 entity with a separate tax I.D. number that is set up.
- 25 But under the Federal bankruptcy -- under the Federal

- 1 tax code, under section 1399, whenever the bankruptcy
- 2 estate had income during the course of the estate,
- 3 during the administration period, as well as the assets
- 4 on the petition filing date, then it's a single taxable
- 5 entity. And so, that single taxpayer would pay it.
- 6 Section 346 doesn't say what assets are used
- 7 to pay the tax. That's a matter of bankruptcy law. The
- 8 debtor, the individual taxpayer, is going to file the
- 9 tax return under State and local and Federal law, but
- 10 he's going to use the estate assets because that's all
- 11 there is. He doesn't have any other assets.
- 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So, the debtor is going
- 13 to pay.
- MS. FREEMAN: The debtor pays --
- 15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And so, when this says
- 16 whenever the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 provides that
- 17 no separate taxable estate shall be created in a case
- 18 concerning a debtor under this title --
- MS. FREEMAN: Right.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- chapter 12 doesn't
- 21 create a separate taxable estate.
- MS. FREEMAN: Correct.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And that the income,
- 24 et cetera, shall be taxed to or claimed by the debtor
- 25 under State or local law.

- 1 MS. FREEMAN: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 2 It's going to be on the debtor's tax return. The
- 3 debtor's the one who will have the deductions, and the
- 4 deductions would include administrative expenses of the
- 5 bankruptcy estate.
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: This -- this is hard for
- 7 me to understand, given the last line. "The estate
- 8 shall be liable for any tax imposed on such corporation
- 9 or partnership, but not for any tax imposed on partners
- 10 or members."
- 11 By the logic of that last sentence, it seems
- 12 to me that the preceding section is not looking to the
- 13 estate, but to the debtor, to pay the taxes.
- MS. FREEMAN: The debtor pays the taxes, but
- 15 with estate assets because those are the only assets
- 16 that exist.
- 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So, why -- why would the
- 18 last sentence be necessary?
- 19 MS. FREEMAN: The last sentence, I believe,
- 20 Your Honor, deals with a partnership, and in a
- 21 partnership case, just as outside the bankruptcy, the
- 22 partnership files the tax return and the partners
- 23 individually are the ones who pay the taxes. But they
- 24 pay the taxes. If a partner is in its own bankruptcy
- 25 estate with the only assets that exist -- all of his

- 1 income, all of his wages, all of those are property of
- 2 the bankruptcy estate, and he would use it to pay the
- 3 taxes. He's not individually liable any more than if a
- 4 trustee were individually liable. The trustee in a
- 5 bankruptcy case uses estate assets to pay taxes. And
- 6 so, what --
- 7 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But it says the estate --
- 8 the estate's not liable for the tax imposed on the
- 9 partners. So, if it's not liable, how can it ask for a
- 10 discharge?
- 11 MS. FREEMAN: The -- the debtor ultimately
- 12 is the one who receives a discharge. Discharge
- 13 provisions are separate than the -- than the tax payment
- 14 issues. Tax payment deals with what moneys are used to
- 15 make the payments of taxes during the course of
- 16 administration of a bankruptcy case. The debtor
- 17 receives a discharge in a chapter 12 case if it
- 18 complies -- if he complies with all of the provisions of
- 19 his plan of reorganization and then receives a
- 20 discharge.
- There are exceptions to the discharge.
- 22 Certain prepetition taxes are excepted from a discharge
- 23 and would carry through during the -- postpetition. But
- 24 the farm sale statute provides that these particular
- 25 administrative expenses would be subject to a discharge

- 1 if he complies with the rest of the provisions of the --
- 2 of his plan of reorganization.
- JUSTICE BREYER: What happens in a 12 or 13
- 4 case, just your typical case -- and this must arise
- 5 fairly often -- in year 1, on January 1, the farm or the
- 6 ship or whatever is the subject goes into chapter 12 or
- 7 13. They have a lot of pre-1 debt. Then in year 2 and
- 8 year 3, the proceedings are going on, but the farm is
- 9 operating, so is the ship, or whatever. And they
- 10 earn -- they run up debts during that time. People give
- 11 them fertilizer -- they -- you know, all kinds of
- 12 things. So, they have a lot of debts that they've run
- 13 up in that time. Now it draws to a close, at the end of
- 14 year 3.
- Now, what about those debts that have been
- 16 run up during that time? There isn't a separate
- 17 bankruptcy estate for tax purposes, I understand. But
- 18 if Joe Smith has loaned his farm some money during that
- 19 time, and it comes time to look at the future income to
- 20 subtract the prepetition debts, does his debt get wound
- 21 up and get some priority in that process, or is he just
- 22 at the end of the queue?
- 23 MS. FREEMAN: He does get priority in that
- 24 process, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Well, if he

- 1 gets priority, then why in heaven's name shouldn't a tax
- 2 get priority?
- 3 MS. FREEMAN: Your Honor --
- 4 JUSTICE BREYER: That's your point.
- 5 MS. FREEMAN: -- it does have that priority.
- 6 JUSTICE BREYER: And if it does, then, of
- 7 course, the exception that Senator Grassley put in
- 8 applies to that. So, that's a question I should ask
- 9 them, given your answer.
- 10 MS. FREEMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
- 11 And, in fact, those taxes, along with the
- 12 light bill and any other administrative expenses, would
- 13 be paid when due over that 2- or 3-year period. And
- 14 that's certainly what happens in the large chapter 11
- 15 bankruptcy case, like a Delphi bankruptcy case or, you
- 16 know, a General Motors, for instance.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but I mean,
- 18 your -- it is a question for you, because these things
- 19 don't go for 2 or 3 years, do they? I thought typically
- 20 they are wrapped up very quickly, and that's to the
- 21 advantage of the debtor. And your position with respect
- 22 to postpetition taxes has the potential of extending
- 23 them beyond the kind of quick turnaround that helps
- everybody.
- MS. FREEMAN: Respectfully, Mr. Chief

- 1 Justice, in chapter 12 cases, often the bankruptcy
- 2 estate will drag on for 2 or 3 years, and certainly for
- 3 longer than 1 year and much longer than a chapter 13
- 4 case, because you do have sales of assets. You have
- 5 debts that need to be restructured. You have leases
- 6 that end up getting rejected. You have a -- new crop
- 7 subsidies that are applied for and received. The
- 8 chapter -- the -- the amicus curiae brief of the
- 9 professors has a study, and shows how long chapter
- 10 12 cases generally last.
- 11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: How long was this --
- 12 this one?
- MS. FREEMAN: This case, Your Honor, because
- of this appeal, has lasted from 2005 through today. So,
- 15 a considerable period of time. And all of the taxes
- 16 during that period of time and all of the operating
- 17 expenses during that period of time are administrative
- 18 expenses and are payable in the ordinary course.
- 19 There's an administrative expense claim if in fact they
- 20 haven't been paid.
- 21 And if -- if one of the creditors has not
- 22 received payment or if a taxing authority has not
- 23 received payment, it can move for payment as an
- 24 administrative priority. It can ask that it be paid
- 25 now, and it can ask that the case be dismissed if it

- 1 hasn't been paid. So, you do have that highest
- 2 priority, and this is consistent with the Court's
- 3 Nicholas case, 1966, which preceded the Bankruptcy Code
- 4 and which the Bankruptcy Code really incorporated and
- 5 continued with.
- In the Nicholas case, the Court said that
- 7 all taxes incurred by a debtor-in-possession and
- 8 incurred during the administration period have
- 9 administrative expense priority, and they are payable by
- 10 the debtor-in-possession as an officer of the court, as
- 11 -- as the administrator of the estate under 28 U.S.C.
- 12 section 960, which is still in effect today, and which
- 13 requires that the person in control of the bankruptcy
- 14 estate, whether it's a trustee or a
- debtor-in-possession, pay those taxes, but not pay them
- 16 with his own money.
- 17 As the Court said in the Nicholas case, you
- 18 pay them with the assets of the estate. The individual
- 19 trustee is not responsible; the individual
- 20 debtor-in-possession is not responsible. The
- 21 responsibility of the debtor-in-possession really is a
- 22 matter of the discharge provisions, whether he's going
- 23 to be separately discharged or if he has responsible
- 24 person liability because he's -- he's -- you're dealing
- with trust fund taxes, with wages from some other

1 person --2 JUSTICE BREYER: The -- what you say to me 3 makes a great deal of sense, but I think one of their 4 stronger arguments is, it may make sense. But, 5 unfortunately, even if Senator Grassley and the others 6 wanted it, they didn't do it right technically. They 7 didn't amend the right provision of the code, and whoever's fault that is, is beside the point. So, 8 there's no way to get the words to get to the result 10 that you want. 11 I'll tell you the best I could do, and I see 12 a problem with it. If you say that -- you go to 13 1226(b)(1), and it says that any unpaid claim of the 14 kind specified in 507(a)(2); and 507(a)(2) talks about 15 administrative expenses and refers you to 503; and 503 16 includes taxes and administrative expenses; and then you say it's -- at 1220 whatever it is, what did I just say? 17 18 MS. FREEMAN: 1226? 19 JUSTICE BREYER: 1226. 20 MS. FREEMAN: Uh-huh. 21 JUSTICE BREYER: It's like an Abbott and Costello movie. 22 23 (Laughter.) 24 JUSTICE BREYER: The -- the -- you get to 25 1226(b)(1), and it says that that's -- shall be paid any

- 1 unpaid payments of that kind, including administrative 2 expenses. And -- and so, then you have 1222(a), which 3 refers to that, and then the amendment applies to that. 4 But what I did was I sloughed over by 5 talking too quickly -- it talked about "claim" -- of a б "claim," it says, any unpaid claim of the kind specified 7 in 507(a)(2). And when you look to 507(a)(2), it talks about claims and expenses; and then in (2) there, it 8 refers to administrative expenses. And so, I think the 9 10 Government says they left out what was key to you, the 11 word "expenses." 12 All right? Now, I don't know what I'm doing 13 when I start tinkering with this Bankruptcy Code. And 14 is that just true, what they say? It does leave out the 15 word "expenses." Will -- will we cause untold harm if 16 we were to read the word "claims" there to include 17 expenses?
- MS. FREEMAN: Your Honor, respectfully, you
- 19 would cause untold harm because this provision applies
- in corporate chapter 11's and in all bankruptcy cases.
- 21 They all have the administrative expense provision, 503,
- 22 and they all have section 507. So, you would stop taxes
- 23 from being payable in a big Delphi --
- JUSTICE BREYER: No, but I was thinking, so
- 25 if I do it by reading the word "claims" --

1	MS. FREEMAN: Right.
2	JUSTICE BREYER: in 5 in 1226, when it
3	says "any unpaid claim"
4	MS. FREEMAN: Right.
5	JUSTICE BREYER: Which is what you want to
б	have include taxes
7	MS. FREEMAN: And claim
8	JUSTICE BREYER: to read that word as
9	including both the $507(a)$ claims, which are in $(1)(a)$ ,
10	(1)(b), and and also administrative expenses in (2).
11	Can I do that?
12	MS. FREEMAN: You can, Your Honor, because
13	"claim" is defined in section 101 of the code as right
14	to payment. "Creditor" is defined as someone who has a
15	claim that arose prepetition, which necessarily means
16	"claim" is broader and not just one that arose
17	prepetition.
18	There are numerous provisions of the
19	Bankruptcy Code that refer to administrative expenses as
20	claims, including 1226. And so, the Court can see that
21	those are interpreted consistently.
22	This Court, in the Hartford Underwriters
23	case, referred to administrative claims, calling them
24	claims as well as administrative. And really what the
25	Government's argument here is that administrative 16

- 1 expenses are outside of bankruptcy altogether, that
- 2 they're not part of what get paid in a bankruptcy case.
- 3 And that's simply untrue.
- 4 If the Court looks at the provisions with
- 5 respect to requirements of a plan, including 1222(a),
- 6 which apart from the exception, it says that
- 7 administrative expenses are required to be paid.
- 8 Section 1228 says that a plan discharges all debts
- 9 including debts provided for -- allowed under section
- 10 503. Debt is a liability on a claim.
- JUSTICE BREYER: But that doesn't answer my
- 12 first question, what actually happens? I mean, this
- isn't the first year of chapter 12 and 13.
- 14 MS. FREEMAN: Right.
- 15 JUSTICE BREYER: And there must be instances
- 16 where the -- where the debts run up postpetition are
- 17 pretty big --
- MS. FREEMAN: And --
- 19 JUSTICE BREYER: -- and there isn't enough
- 20 money to go around, and they're going to have to be paid
- 21 out of future income along with the prepetition debts.
- 22 And it can be done, but there is a question of
- 23 priorities, and the Government is saying there is no
- 24 priority -- I think they're saying that -- for a
- 25 postpetition debt. And -- and you're saying, oh, but of

- 1 course there is.
- 2 So, what actually happens? There have been
- 3 perhaps thousands and thousands of cases, haven't there?
- 4 MS. FREEMAN: And administrative expenses do
- 5 get paid in the ordinary course. And if the taxes
- 6 aren't paid --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Get paid, if necessary, by
- 8 assigning priorities?
- 9 MS. FREEMAN: Yes. They have administrative
- 10 priority, and they do get paid.
- 11 JUSTICE BREYER: And so, to look to a
- 12 hornbook on bankruptcy law which just tells me what
- 13 you've just said, I would look where?
- MS. FREEMAN: We -- we've cited a number of
- 15 hornbooks that have exactly that provision. What's
- 16 particular interesting with respect to the Government's
- 17 position here is that, at the Government's urging,
- 18 section 507(a)(8) of the Bankruptcy Code, that provided
- 19 for prepetition priority, eighth priority, for
- 20 prepetition taxes within a short period before the
- 21 Bankruptcy Code, was amended; so that all of those
- 22 eighth priority taxes during the year of the filing, the
- 23 straddle year -- here the Halls filed their bankruptcy
- 24 case in August; so, during the entire period from
- 25 January 1 through August when they filed -- are treated

- 1 as administrative expenses. And yet, now they say
- 2 administrative expenses mean nothing, and they don't get
- 3 any payment as administrative expenses.
- 4 Why urge the change? Why make all of those
- 5 year-of-filing taxes into administrative expenses and
- 6 then say the administrative expenses have no meaning?
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm going to ask the
- 8 Government this, but are you aware of any circuit split
- 9 or any cases below that have accepted the Government's
- 10 arguments that chapter 12 involves prepetition debts
- only and that don't pay administrative expenses
- 12 postbankruptcy?
- MS. FREEMAN: There are several cases that
- 14 have interpreted section 1222(a)(2)(A). None of them
- 15 have addressed the change in 507 or what that means.
- 16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That's a different
- 17 question.
- MS. FREEMAN: Okay.
- 19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The Government's now
- 20 saying that chapter 12 involves only prepetition claims.
- MS. FREEMAN: Right.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And it's basically, by
- that argument, saying it doesn't involve and can't
- involve administrative expenses. That's how I read
- 25 their argument.

1	MS. FREEMAN: I think that's
2	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And so, I'm asking is
3	are there any courts that you're aware of below who have
4	been presented with this argument, outside of the tax
5	situation, who have accepted it?
6	MS. FREEMAN: I
7	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Who have failed to give
8	priority to administrative expenses?
9	MS. FREEMAN: None outside of this tax
LO	situation. And, Your Honor, I don't believe that any of
L1	the cases that have followed the Government's
L2	interpretation of this farm sale statute, 1222(a)(2)(A),
L3	have addressed the impact on other administrative
L 4	expenses and other tax claims. The wages the taxes
L5	on wages that are incurred, the lottery winnings that an
L6	individual farmer might have, and the fact that those
L7	have administrative priority and that those would need
L8	to be paid off the top as administrative expenses
L9	none of the cases address those.
20	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm not asking you to
21	defend their position.
22	MS. FREEMAN: Okay.
23	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It's just such a broad
24	position that I'm trying to understand if there's a
25	split out there that we are unaware of. 20

1 MS. FREEMAN: And the problem, Your Honor, 2 is that it does have these broad impacts, and none of 3 the courts have really addressed it. And I don't 4 believe that certainly the --5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So, can we go back to the issue that gives me trouble? б 7 MS. FREEMAN: Yes, Your Honor. 8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: How to read "incurred by 9 the estate." If the estate doesn't pay taxes --10 MS. FREEMAN: To incur --11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- how could it be 12 incurred by the estate when Congress, if it intended what you're saying it intended, could have said 13 14 "incurred during bankruptcy"? 15 MS. FREEMAN: Incurred -- to incur is to 16 take on liability. So, at the point in time that income 17 is generated during a bankruptcy case, then liabilities 18 are taken on at the same time, the operating expenses, the taxes. Here, you had a clear estate asset, the Hall 19 20 farm. It was sold. That generates an income tax 21 liability, a capital gains liability. And so, that is -- it's tied to the income, which is here property of 22 23 the estate. The -- the important thing is --24 JUSTICE SCALIA: But -- but the problem is 25 that, with an exception that -- that's not applicable

- 1 here, section 1399 of the Internal Revenue Code provides
- 2 that no separate taxable entity shall result from the
- 3 commencement of a case under Title XI of the United
- 4 States Code.
- 5 How can you incur a tax when you are not a
- 6 separate taxable entity?
- 7 MS. FREEMAN: Your Honor, because you are a
- 8 single taxable entity instead of a separate taxable
- 9 entity. The whole reason for the separate taxable
- 10 entity section was when you had a bankruptcy estate that
- 11 consisted only of the assets on the petition filing
- 12 date, and the debtor earns income independently. So,
- 13 the debtor would independently have tax liability, and
- 14 that would be separate from the estate.
- But when you have a reorganization case, a
- 16 corporate chapter 11 or a chapter 12, then the estate
- 17 and the debtor are a single taxable entity, and the
- 18 debtor is the one that files the tax returns or the
- 19 debtor-in-possession, the trustee, if there's a trustee
- 20 in control --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, if -- if that
- 22 exception were intended, the provision I read contains
- 23 an exception. It says "except in any case to which
- 24 section 1398 applies." 1398 applies to chapter 7 and
- 25 chapter 11 where the debtor is an individual.

Τ	MS. FREEMAN: 'I'nat's
2	JUSTICE SCALIA: Now, if there is an
3	additional exception for chapter 12 of the sort that you
4	allege, why wasn't that put in there?
5	MS. FREEMAN: There is no exception, and
6	there shouldn't be an exception, Your Honor. They're
7	within section 1399, just like corporate chapter 11
8	debtors. The debtor is the one that files the tax
9	return. The debtor and estate are one. All of that
10	corporate earnings, all of the wages, the lottery
11	winnings, the farm sale proceeds, all of those are part
12	of the estate. And so, the
13	JUSTICE SCALIA: What does it mean, then, to
14	say that no taxable "no separate taxable entity shall
15	result"? What does it mean, unless it means that it is
16	not the estate which incurs the tax?
17	MS. FREEMAN: Your Honor, respectfully,
18	there's a difference between taxable entity and estate.
19	The estate is a collection of property. That is the
20	collection of property that's operated by the
21	debtor-in-possession or trustee in a reorganization
22	case.
23	JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, but they but they
24	would not have needed the exceptions for chapter 7 and
25	chapter 11 where the debtor is an individual if what you $23$

- 1 say is true, if indeed a bankrupt estate is, as you say,
- 2 not an entity at all.
- 3 MS. FREEMAN: You need that exception, Your
- 4 Honor, in a chapter 7 case for an individual because the
- 5 individual earns income that is wholly independent from
- 6 the estate, that's not part of the estate. So that the
- 7 bankruptcy estate consists of the assets the individual
- 8 owns on the petition filing date. The trustee
- 9 administers those, sells the assets, may incur some
- 10 liability for selling the assets for taxes, pays those,
- 11 and deals with those, while the individual continues to
- 12 earn income postpetition that's his own income. And so,
- 13 you need to have a separate taxable estate in those
- 14 instances.
- But when the income that's earned during
- 16 this whole period of administration, from the petition
- 17 filing date to the confirmation date of the plan, is all
- 18 property of the estate, then the debtor, the corporate
- 19 chapter 11 debtor or the -- the corporate chapter 12
- 20 debtor or the individual chapter 12 debtor is incurring
- 21 that income as part of the estate. It's all property of
- the estate in a chapter 12 case. Section 1207 says
- 23 that.
- And so, the debtor is the one that files the
- 25 tax returns, and the debtor uses the estate assets to  $\frac{24}{24}$

1	make the payments of the taxes and to make the payments
2	on the light bill and to make the payments on all of the
3	other expenses of administration during this period of
4	administration. That's what this Court held in
5	Nicholas, and that continues on in effect today.
6	JUSTICE KAGAN: But, Ms. Freeman, wouldn't
7	it be fair to say then that the taxes are incurred by
8	the debtor and payable out of the estate? Why would it
9	say "incurred by the estate"?
10	MS. FREEMAN: It uses the term "incurred by
11	the estate" I think based upon the same kind of language
12	that this Court used in Nicholas, as incurred by the
13	incurred during the administration period, incurred by
14	the debtor-in-possession. It's it's really a broad
15	sense of all of the kinds of bankruptcy estates in a
16	chapter 7 case. It this refers to all bankruptcy
17	cases.
18	And so, in a chapter 7 case, it's going to
19	be just the assets that exist there on the petition
20	filing date. If it's a corporate case, it's going to be
21	the all of the assets that are generating the income
22	during the course of the administration of the chapter
23	12 or the chapter 11 case or even the chapter 13 case.
24	In chapter 13 cases, you have a specific

additional provision, section 1305, that deals with \$25>

25

- 1 taxes payable postpetition, and it also includes
- 2 postconfirmation. So, it gives the government a broader
- 3 kind of right so that --
- 4 JUSTICE GINSBURG: The argument is made
- 5 against your position that 1305 is one of the provisions
- 6 that was featured, I think, both in the Ninth Circuit
- 7 and the Tenth Circuit, and their position seems to be
- 8 that 1305 gives the government an election.
- 9 MS. FREEMAN: It does, Your Honor, provide
- 10 for an election for the government. What's important is
- 11 that in a 13 case, unlike a 12 or an 11, you have a very
- 12 short period of administration. They have to file their
- 13 plan within 15 days. It's confirmed within a month or
- 14 two. And it's very unlikely that April 15th is going to
- 15 fall within that short period of time, and that's when
- 16 the Government says that your taxes are incurred. So,
- 17 you're going to have a -- it's unlikely you're going to
- 18 have an administrative expense claim for your income
- 19 taxes during the period of administration of a chapter
- 20 13. It's a very short period.
- So, the government has the option not only
- 22 during the administration period, but also during the
- 23 whole period of the plan, to elect to say: All right,
- there have been some big commissions earned here, and I
- want to go ahead and collect from the estate rather than

- 1 just wait and see what the debtor earns afterwards. And
- 2 so, it then can go ahead and file a claim and ask to
- 3 have that claim paid out of the bankruptcy estate, and
- 4 it really gives the government much broader rights than
- 5 it does in a normal chapter 11 or a chapter 12 case or a
- 6 7.
- 7 If I may reserve the remainder of my time
- 8 for rebuttal.
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 10 Ms. Freeman.
- MS. FREEMAN: Thank you.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Mr. Shah.
- ORAL ARGUMENT OF PRATIK A. SHAH
- ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT
- MR. SHAH: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
- 16 please the Court:
- 17 The postpetition income tax liability at
- issue in this case is not subject to section 1222(a)(2)
- 19 and thus cannot be treated as a dischargeable
- 20 nonpriority debt for two reasons. First, consistent
- 21 with the structure of chapter 12, a chapter 12 plan is
- 22 limited to prepetition debts and does not cover
- 23 postpetition debts, including administrative expenses.
- 24 Rather, postpetition administrative expenses are paid
- 25 separately through section 1226(b)(1), which contains no

- 1 farm sale exception. Because section 1222(a)(2)(A)
- 2 strips priority only from a subset of claims covered by
- 3 a chapter 12 plan and does not alter which debts fall
- 4 within that plan, it cannot apply to the postpetition
- 5 tax liability at issue.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: So, what -- what farm
- 7 sales would be included? What farm sales would get this
- 8 benefit that Senator Grassley obviously wanted them to
- 9 have?
- 10 MR. SHAH: Your Honor, it would be
- 11 prepetition sales. That is, any capital gains tax
- 12 incurred from a prepetition sale, those would be
- 13 priority expenses covered under a chapter 12 plan under
- 14 section 1222(a)(2), because they fall under -- they're
- 15 an -- they're a priority claim under section 507(a).
- 16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Does that -- does
- 17 that make sense, though, in terms of if you're talking
- 18 about farmers and fishermen and you're talking about the
- 19 treatment of their central asset, whether it's the farm
- 20 or typically the boat, and they either want to try --
- 21 they want to try to save the farm or the boat, and they
- 22 go into bankruptcy, and the big issue is how that
- 23 asset's going to be treated. And your position is it's
- 24 not in the bankruptcy at all; it's outside of it. That
- 25 seems to me to be at least counterintuitive.

1	MR. SHAH: Well, Your Honor, two points:
2	One, as a practical matter, chapter 12 is a
3	reorganization provision. It's not a provision just
4	designed to allow farmers to get out of the business of
5	farming. So, often what will happen is that farmers
6	will try to reorganize some of their farm sale assets,
7	sell some of their livestock, change their farming
8	operation, to see if they can save it outside of
9	bankruptcy first.
10	All of those sales an example of that is
11	the Knudsen case. Knudsen is the only circuit case to
12	go Petitioners' way. In Knudsen, it not only involved
13	the postpetition tax liability of the type at issue in
14	this case; it also had a significant prepetition tax
15	liability component in that case based upon just what I
16	was explaining, the farmer trying to trying to change
17	their farming operation to save the farm without having
18	to go into bankruptcy.
19	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yes, but also, I
20	gather, it's a fairly typical situation where you have
21	farmers that might want to sell part of the farm. You
22	know, they have dairy and corn operations or something,
23	and they sell one to try to preserve the other. And
24	that's that's exactly the sort of thing that should
25	be considered in the bankruptcy context. And yet, your

- 1 position says we're going to treat it outside the
- 2 bankruptcy.
- MR. SHAH: Well, Your Honor, it certainly
- 4 happens within the bankruptcy, and I'm not disputing
- 5 your point that that may -- that may arise in a
- 6 bankruptcy case just like it arises in this case. And
- 7 it will be dealt through the bankruptcy. That is, the
- 8 sale will happen, and it will be approved by the
- 9 bankruptcy court. The question is, how do you treat the
- 10 capital gains tax arising --
- 11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But that's a big
- 12 deal if you're deciding how the plan's going to work,
- 13 whether they -- I mean, what the amount was here was big
- 14 for the farmer, and the idea of, well, we're going to
- 15 pretend that's not at issue here seems to me to be --
- 16 again, not -- not to make a lot of sense.
- MR. SHAH: Your Honor, we're not asking, to
- 18 be clear, to pretend that that's not there. How the tax
- 19 liability would be dealt with under the Government's
- 20 view is at the time the debtor moves to sell the farm
- 21 asset during the bankruptcy case -- like in this case,
- that sale of the farm asset generated \$960,000. That
- 23 was the sale price. The capital gains tax liability in
- 24 this case is \$29,000. If they would have set aside from
- 25 that \$960,000 sale price \$29,000 to pay the capital

- 1 gains tax debt, that would resolve the issue. We're not
- 2 saying that you ignore it.
- 3 JUSTICE KAGAN: But there's every reason to
- 4 think, Mr. Shah, that what Congress was worried about
- 5 here was cases in which the bankruptcy plan would not be
- 6 approved at all because there were very high capital
- 7 gains taxes that would result from a sale and that that
- 8 was the problem that everybody was focused on, was
- 9 making sure that farmers could take advantage of section
- 10 12. So, it's a little bit odd -- it's actually more
- 11 than a little bit odd. It's a lot odd to read the
- 12 statute to apply not in that context but only as to
- 13 people who have somehow managed to sell their property,
- 14 you know, 18 months before going into bankruptcy.
- MR. SHAH: Sure. So, Your Honor, when you
- 16 say that everybody was focused on this problem, we have
- 17 the evidence of exactly one person as to what one
- 18 legislator thought that this bill would do. That's
- 19 Senator Grassley. Now, admittedly, Senator Grassley's
- 20 statements do indicate an intent on his part to reach
- 21 postpetition taxes. But the pre-existing statutory
- 22 framework does not permit that result.
- What section 1222(a)(2)(A) does is it allows
- 24 the debtor to strip priority from a certain subset of
- 25 governmental claims, such as prepetition taxes, and

- 1 there is no doubt that Senator Grassley correctly
- 2 understood that's how section 1222(a)(2) --
- JUSTICE ALITO: But it's not just Senator
- 4 Grassley. Your interpretation makes this provision,
- 5 1222(a)(2)(A), of very, very little practical value.
- 6 And you think that's what Congress intended? Not only
- 7 would it -- would it mean that postpetition capital
- 8 gains on the sale of part of the farm or the entire farm
- 9 would -- would be outside of the bankruptcy, outside of
- 10 the bankruptcy, but all of the prepetition capital gains
- 11 would be outside of it too, unless they occurred in a
- 12 previous taxable year.
- MR. SHAH: A couple of responses, Your
- 14 Honor. First of all, I don't think it's sort of a null
- 15 set or a vanishingly small set. There's the Knudsen
- 16 case which qualifies. Of -- in the professors' amicus
- 17 brief, on page 10a of their amicus brief, they provide a
- 18 chart of representative cases involving postpetition tax
- 19 liabilities. They cite eight cases in their chart on
- 20 page 10a. Three of those eight cases involve
- 21 significant prepetition tax liabilities, even under the
- 22 narrower definition of "prepetition."
- 23 But -- but to get to your larger point, even
- 24 to the extent it might be narrower than what Congress
- 25 intended, Congress certainly knew how section 1222

- 1 operated in the sense that it would strip priority from
- 2 certain claims that are already entitled to priority
- 3 under a chapter 12 plan, such as prepetition taxes. And
- 4 both sides agree that that's how section 1220(a)(2)(A)
- 5 works. There's no dispute about that.
- 6 The dispute is about whether this
- 7 postpetition tax liability comes within the chapter 12
- 8 plan in the first place. That dispute turns on
- 9 pre-existing code provisions, part of the 1978 Act, part
- of the 1980 Act, and the 1986 Act. Whatever deference
- 11 Senator Grassley is owed as to the operation of section
- 12 1220(a)(2)(A) itself, he's owed no deference whatsoever
- 13 as to the proper interpretation of those pre-existing
- 14 code provisions.
- 15 It's our position that these pre-existing
- 16 code provisions, section 503(b), section 346, and
- 17 section 1398, 1399, all lead to the result that
- 18 postpetition tax liabilities are not an administrative
- 19 expense within the meaning of the code.
- 20 JUSTICE GINSBURG: How about employment tax?
- 21 Employment taxes?
- MR. SHAH: Your Honor, employment taxes
- 23 arguably could be treated differently. Now, as a matter
- 24 of discretion, IRS has chosen not to treat them
- 25 differently. That is, they don't try to seek those as

administrative expenses. I think there would be an 1 2 argument -- and we set this -- set forth the argument in 3 a footnote of our brief. What the potential argument 4 would be is that they could be deemed an administrative 5 expense not because they're incurred by the estate, but 6 under the other part of the definition of an 7 administrative expense under 503(b)(1)(A). 8 JUSTICE BREYER: Just following up on 9 that --10 MR. SHAH: Yes. 11 JUSTICE BREYER: -- I'm looking for what I'd call past practice, where there must be a lot --12 13 MR. SHAH: Yes. 14 JUSTICE BREYER: -- that would shed some 15 light on this. So, I see -- your point that we cannot 16 call these taxes administrative expenses is because when that's defined in 503 for the entire code --17 18 MR. SHAH: Yes. JUSTICE BREYER: -- it talks about 19 20 administrative expenses incurred by the estate. 21 MR. SHAH: Yes, Your Honor. JUSTICE BREYER: And so, you're saying here 22 are three people who incurred their own taxes. One is 23 24 section -- section 12; one is section 13; and one is

individuals in section 11. Is that right?

25

1	MR. SHAH: Ah
2	JUSTICE BREYER: At least that's my
3	MR. SHAH: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
4	JUSTICE BREYER: Yes. Okay. So, we have
5	three categories of people that where the taxes,
6	literally taken, they incur postpetition taxes. Now,
7	the bite would come up if it turned out, when they were
8	getting around to settle these things, that there isn't
9	enough money to pay fully the postpetition or let's
10	no, to pay fully domestic support obligations, wages,
11	and also Federal taxes.
12	Isn't that that's where it's going to
13	show up, because the question will be, do you have to
14	shave the Federal taxes because they're coming in to be
15	paid as an administrative expense priority which is
16	only there as number 2, I think, in light of number 1.
17	Or do you not shave them at all? If they're liable
18	personally, there isn't any reduction in the amount of
19	the Federal Government if they're allowed because
20	it's one of the estate's expenses basically, using the
21	estate very, very loosely, then they would have to take
22	a reduction, too. Am I right? Are you following it?
23	MR. SHAH: I think so. Let me try to say
24	what I think what you're saying. Under chapter 12 and
25	13, if it is in fact a priority claim, whether it's a $35$

- 1 priority claim or an administrative expense, those have
- 2 to be paid in full. There isn't an ability for the
- 3 court to shave those --
- 4 JUSTICE BREYER: No. The administrative
- 5 expenses don't have to be paid in full if there isn't
- 6 enough money for them too in unsecured claims for
- 7 domestic support obligations, because administrative
- 8 expenses is the second priority; it isn't the first.
- 9 MR. SHAH: Okay. So, Your Honor, there is a
- 10 misunderstanding I think in what you are saying. That
- 11 is, in a chapter 12 plan, the priorities matter more in
- 12 terms of the relative priority between category 1, 2, 3,
- 13 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. They matter more in a chapter 7
- 14 liquidation where there's a finite set of assets being
- 15 liquidated, and then those will be paid out in the
- 16 priority that you're talking about. In a chapter 12 or
- 17 13 case, there's going to be a plan proposed, and that
- 18 plan will be confirmed.
- Now, under 1222(a)(2), any of those priority
- 20 claims, whether it's first priority or eighth priority,
- 21 has to be set out and to be paid in full in order for
- 22 the plan to be confirmed.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Okay.
- MR. SHAH: So, the plan won't be confirmed
- 25 at all. There isn't a matter of ordering the priorities

- 1 in a chapter 12 or 13 case.
- Now, if I could turn back to Justice
- 3 Sotomayor's question.
- 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Could you turn back
- 5 to -- before you answer my other question, could you
- 6 finish your thought on what you're doing with wages?
- 7 Are they given priority or aren't they? If you're
- 8 saying they're not -- if we accept your reading of this,
- 9 employee wage taxes are not administrative expenses.
- 10 MR. SHAH: Right. Or -- well, Your Honor,
- 11 they're certainly not administrative expenses under the
- 12 definition of incurred by the estate. That would be the
- 13 relevant issue in this case. They may come under the
- 14 other definition of administrative expense; that is, the
- 15 costs -- necessary costs of preserving the estate, like
- 16 wages. If you consider the employment payroll tax
- 17 that's paid simultaneously as the wage, as part and
- 18 parcel of the wages, you could get at it that way. But,
- 19 again, that doesn't have anything to do with the
- 20 "incurred by the estate" language.
- The "incurred by the estate" language, as
- 22 you properly point out, is relevant -- the most relevant
- 23 provisions as to whether a tax is incurred by the estate
- 24 are sections 346(b) and 1398 and 1399 --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: How does that work,

- 1 Mr. Shah? Because this was a part of your argument that
- 2 I have to say sort of tripped me up --
- 3 MR. SHAH: Okay.
- 4 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- because you define
- 5 "incurred by the estate" by reference to those
- 6 provisions, but those provisions were enacted 2 years
- 7 and 4 years after the phrase that you are trying to
- 8 define.
- 9 MR. SHAH: Sure.
- 10 JUSTICE KAGAN: So, it must have been a very
- 11 prescient Congress.
- MR. SHAH: Well, Your Honor it was a
- 13 prescient Congress, because in the legislative history
- 14 that we cite, they say -- and it's not true that all of
- 15 the -- separate taxable entity rules weren't implemented
- 16 until afterwards. There -- section 346, which dealt
- 17 admittedly only with State and local taxes, they set up
- 18 rules, the same separate taxable entity rules that
- 19 Congress later enacted 2 years later, to apply to State
- 20 and local entities. And that's the provision 346 that's
- 21 reprinted in our appendix at page 2.
- What Congress said when they passed 346 is
- "we fully" -- "we fully expect" -- and as they had
- 24 originally drafted them in the 1978 Act, to also apply
- 25 to Federal taxes. But it decided to pull them out of

- 1 the Act so as not to step on the shoes of the
- 2 jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. That's
- 3 the explanation that Congress provided and then 2
- 4 years --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: But you're saying that as of
- 6 1978, there was kind of an idea in people's heads about
- 7 this separate tax entity or at least in some people's
- 8 heads, but that idea had never been converted into any
- 9 statutory language. And you're suggesting that we
- 10 should take this phrase "incurred by the estate" and
- 11 read it as if they were referring to something real that
- 12 was in a statute.
- MR. SHAH: It's not simply taking out of
- 14 their head, Your Honor; it's -- the section 346 rules
- 15 which are parallel and apply to State and local taxes,
- 16 those didn't come out of nowhere. Those came out of
- 17 prior IRS rulings as to when there is a separate taxable
- 18 entity in a bankruptcy case.
- 19 There were pre-existing -- before the 1978
- 20 Act, in particular, there was a 1972 IRS revenue ruling
- 21 which set forth the rules about when there's a separate
- 22 taxable entity, whether the Act should -- whether the
- 23 tax should be taxed to the estate or to the debtor.
- 24 Section 346 in the 1978 Act codified those rules for
- 25 State and local income taxes.

1 In the intervening 2	2 3	years	between	1978	and
------------------------	-----	-------	---------	------	-----

- 2 1980 when Congress consummated the step and extended
- 3 those to Federal taxes, the IRS was still applying its
- 4 pre-existing practice based on its revenue ruling. So,
- 5 there wasn't a gap where there was no guidance as to
- 6 whether -- how to determine whether these were incurred
- 7 by the estate or not.
- 8 Courts may -- courts readily would have
- 9 looked, I presume, to the 1972 Treasury ruling and the
- 10 parallel 346 rulings in that gap time until the
- 11 legislative guidance came along and then codified that
- 12 result with respect to Federal taxes.
- Now, I think to --
- 14 JUSTICE KAGAN: Can I ask another
- 15 question --
- MR. SHAH: Sure.
- 17 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- while we are on this?
- 18 Because the 1398, 1399 would suggest that we're looking
- 19 to this separate taxable entity, but if I understand
- 20 correctly, in the corporate context, the IRS actually
- 21 does not look to that. It looks to just the question of
- 22 who's filing the tax return.
- So, if that's the case, aren't you, in that
- 24 very large bankruptcy context, losing your textual
- 25 anchor entirely?

1	MR. SHAH: No, Your Honor. There are two
2	ways that a bankruptcy estate can incur a tax. One is
3	if it's a separate taxable entity, then it then it's
4	responsible for the taxes. All the taxes are taxed to
5	the estate, and it has to file the return and pay it.
6	The other way is if it has the duty to file
7	the return. That's a different provision of the
8	Internal Revenue Code, section 6012(b)(3). 6012(b)(3)
9	also appears in the Government's in the appendix to
LO	the Government's brief. What 6012(b)(3) on page 14a
L1	says is that, in a bankruptcy case, the trustee of a
L2	corporate bankruptcy estate shall make the return for
L3	income in a corporation.
L 4	What this Court held in Holywell, which both
L5	sides cite and both sides agree, is that when a
L6	corporate trustee has a duty to file a return under
L7	6012(b)(3), it also has a duty to pay the tax. That is,
L8	it incurs it's liable for or incurs the tax.
L9	So, there are two ways to incur the tax:
20	One is separate taxable entity; the other way is if the
21	code imposes an obligation on the bankruptcy estate
22	to to file and pay the tax return. That's the other
23	way to interpret it, and that's why all the chapter 7
24	and 11 corporate cases that are cited by Petitioners are
25	inapt. In those cases, the postpetition tax liabilities $41$

- 1 are, in fact, incurred by the estate.
- What's remarkable is that Petitioners do not
- 3 cite a single chapter 12 case in which a postpetition
- 4 tax liability has been treated as an administrative
- 5 expense. Chapter 12 has been around since 1986, and
- 6 yet, there is not -- if this was such a big problem that
- 7 Congress was trying to get at it through this way, you
- 8 would have expected at least a single case in which a
- 9 postpetition tax liability had been treated as an
- 10 administrative expense.
- 11 JUSTICE BREYER: How would it show up? I
- 12 mean, what difference -- suppose -- suppose you -- in 11
- individual, 12, or 13, what's the difference whether you
- 14 treated it as an administrative expense or not, as long
- 15 as they all have to be paid anyway, you say?
- 16 MR. SHAH: Sure. So, the difference is, in
- 17 chapter 12 and 13, they are treated outside of the
- 18 bankruptcy plan itself, but they do need to be paid up
- 19 front. And, in fact, they receive a special --
- 20 JUSTICE BREYER: No. I mean, how would we
- 21 know? How would we know --
- MR. SHAH: Oh, that they're treated
- 23 differently?
- JUSTICE BREYER: Yes.
- MR. SHAH: Through the code. So, in chapter

- 1 12 and 13, 1226(b)(1) and 1326(b)(1), the parallel
- 2 provisions in chapter 13, they pull out administrative
- 3 expenses. They pull them out --
- 4 JUSTICE BREYER: No. Let's imagine you're
- 5 absolutely right. They mean to treat them differently.
- 6 MR. SHAH: Yes.
- 7 JUSTICE BREYER: They mean to treat the
- 8 postpetition tax obligation to the Federal Government
- 9 not as an administrative expense. But this is an
- 10 instance where the business will continue, and,
- 11 therefore, you have said in order to continue, you have
- 12 to pay all your tax liability and all your
- 13 administrative expenses.
- MR. SHAH: Yes.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Therefore, what difference
- 16 does it make whether you do or whether you don't treat
- 17 them as administrative expenses? What is the
- 18 operational difference?
- 19 MR. SHAH: Sure. Your Honor, it would be to
- 20 the government's advantage if these were in the ordinary
- 21 course -- at least before section 1222(a)(2)(A) was
- 22 enacted that stripped priority, it would have been in
- 23 the government's advantage to take the position that
- 24 these were administrative expenses. And the reason why
- 25 it's favorable to the government is, those have to be  $\frac{12}{12}$

- 1 paid up front as part of the bankruptcy.
- 2 If you don't treat them as administrative
- 3 expenses -- and the government took the self-denying
- 4 position here in the years leading up to 2005,
- 5 consistently taking the position these were not
- 6 administrative expenses, even though it was to the
- 7 government's disadvantage, because the code required
- 8 that interpretation. And the disadvantage is you don't
- 9 get -- the government didn't get them paid up front as
- 10 administrative expenses. They would have to collect
- 11 them outside of the bankruptcy. And when you go to
- 12 collect them outside of the bankruptcy, there's much
- 13 more uncertainty. There may not be any --
- 14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it's certainly
- 15 not a self-denying position now, right? You're arguing
- 16 that these are -- that the taxes of this sort are
- 17 administrative expenses when that puts you at the head
- 18 of the line. You're arguing that they are not
- 19 administrative expenses, same type of taxes, when it
- 20 puts you at the back of the line, even though the
- 21 provision that puts you at the back of the line was
- 22 designed to particularly help the fishermen and -- and
- 23 farmers.
- MR. SHAH: Your Honor, that -- that's just
- 25 not true. Dating back to 1998 -- and these are cited in  $^{44}$

1	the Government's brief at pages 16a to 18a. Dating back
2	to 1998, the government had consistently taken the
3	position that postpetition tax liabilities
4	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No, I'm talking
5	about the position you're taking now. You argue for
6	MR. SHAH: We have maintained our
7	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: different
8	treatment of these taxes as to whether or not they're
9	administrative expenses not solely, but it leads to
10	the result that you get the money first either way.
11	MR. SHAH: Because Congress the
12	government has stayed consistent in its position.
13	Because Congress has changed the rules, it turns out
14	that that same interpretation
15	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but then
16	you're saying that Congress changed the rules in a way
17	that, as Justice Alito's question suggested, really
18	doesn't do much at all, when what they wanted to do was
19	provide some real protection for farmers and fishermen.
20	MR. SHAH: I can't speak to what Congress
21	wanted to do. If in fact they wanted to do that, then
22	they did it the wrong way. They could have
23	JUSTICE GINSBURG: What would be what
24	would be the right way?
25	MR. SHAH: You could easily enact a separate 45

- 1 provision within 1222 that said something like -- use
- 2 the language something like section 1305, that said any
- 3 taxes that become payable after of the filing of the
- 4 petition shall be treated as non-dischargeable,
- 5 nonpriority debts and paid that way.
- 6 But they didn't do that. And I think
- 7 section 1305 is critical here, and this goes to your
- 8 question, Mr. Chief Justice, as well, that the
- 9 government is trying to take advantage here. The --
- 10 adopting Petitioners' position would have a significant
- 11 ripple effect in chapter 13. This is not simply a
- 12 matter of trying to get to the result that Senator
- 13 Grassley intended by narrowly interpreting
- 14 1222(a)(2)(A), and it won't have any other effect in the
- 15 code. It will have a significant effect in the intended
- 16 operation of chapter 13.
- 17 And -- and the reason why that's important
- 18 is, is to put this in perspective, there are about 600
- 19 to 700 total chapter 12 filings each year. There's
- 20 somewhere in the upwards of 400,000 chapter 13 filings
- 21 each year, and here's where it would throw a wrench into
- 22 chapter 13. If you look at section 1305 of chapter
- 23 13 -- and that's reproduced on page 11a of the
- 24 Government's appendix. What 1305(a)(1) does is it
- 25 provides a special procedure for the government to file

- 1 a claim for postpetition taxes, exactly the type of tax
- 2 at issue in this case. It says: Government, you can go
- 3 file a claim to have that included within the bankruptcy
- 4 plan.
- 5 If -- if you adopt Petitioners' position,
- 6 there would never be a case in which the government
- 7 would ever have any occasion to invoke 1305(a)(1),
- 8 because they --
- 9 JUSTICE KAGAN: But why would that be a
- 10 problem? You said that there would be a significant
- 11 ripple effect and practical difficulties. And I
- 12 understand your argument about 13 shows that you have to
- do this and why would 13 be necessary if Petitioner were
- 14 right, but you started out, I thought --
- MR. SHAH: It -- yes.
- 16 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- by trying to show us that
- 17 it would be a significant practical problem --
- 18 MR. SHAH: I said it would be a significant
- 19 disruption to the intended operation of chapter 13. In
- 20 practice, it would actually mean that the government
- 21 comes out better under chapter 13 than in the
- 22 government's current position, because what Petitioners'
- 23 position would do, if you read --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: So, it just does
- 25 automatically for the government what is now done by --

- 1 by some kind of government filing?
- MR. SHAH: Well -- well, not even that, Your
- 3 Honor, because under -- the reason why 1305(a)(1) would
- 4 be dead letter -- you could just rip that page out of
- 5 the code and throw it away if you accept Petitioners'
- 6 reading. The reason why that's true is because under
- 7 their reading, it would get administrative expense
- 8 priority, which are paid up front, super-priority, even
- 9 before anything else; but under 1305(a)(1), it doesn't
- 10 get administrative expense priority; it may not even get
- 11 any priority at all.
- 12 And so, it's a significant change in the
- 13 operation of how the government would be seeking
- 14 postpetition tax liabilities. Now, it would work to the
- 15 detriment of the debtor in chapter 13 cases, the upwards
- 16 of 400,000 chapter 13 cases that would occur --
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But those are --
- 18 those are small potatoes compared to the sale of a farm
- 19 and a boat, right?
- MR. SHAH: I would -- I would --
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Would there -- this
- 22 particular issue of large capital gains from a sale of
- 23 significant assets doesn't typically arise in the
- 24 chapter 13 cases.
- MR. SHAH: Sure, the capital gains tax

	·
1	wouldn't, but there's all sorts of postpetition income
2	taxes that would arise in a chapter 13 case. In a
3	chapter 13 case, those are wages that are being incurred
4	after the filing of the petition. All of the taxes on
5	those wages after the petition would be the the type
6	of would be eligible for postpetition tax treatment.
7	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, in chapter
8	chapter 13 cases are the ones that you that are
9	typically resolved very quickly, right?
10	MR. SHAH: Your Honor, it is true that
11	from the statistics that I have seen, on average we're
12	talking about 4 months in a chapter 13 case. On average
13	in in a chapter 12 case, according to the professors'
14	amicus brief, median time is about 8 months.
15	What's clear from the legislative history,
16	the reason why Congress set up the chapter 13 rules as
17	to make the tax incurred by the debtor rather than by
18	the estate is because Congress expressly said in the
19	legislative history, which is cited in our brief, that
20	they expected the confirmation time to be relatively
21	quickly in a chapter 13 case.
22	We know that they made the same assumption
23	in the chapter 12 case because, one, they enacted the
24	same separate taxable entity rules; and, two, they put

25

in actual deadlines in the code for chapter 13: 90 days  $\phantom{0}49$ 

- 1 to propose a plan, 45 days to confirm it. So, roughly
- 2 4 months is what Congress had extended.
- Now, in practice, it's been the case that
- 4 bankruptcy courts have extended that time beyond the
- 5 statutory deadlines. So, perhaps they are open a couple
- 6 months longer than what Congress had expected. But that
- 7 wasn't the intent that Congress had enacted this with,
- 8 and if Congress wants to change that, it can go back and
- 9 rewrite the rules to -- to make that change.
- 10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, before you
- 11 finish, could you answer my question of what impact your
- 12 broader reading, your chapter 12, affects only
- 13 prepetition debts? What else is that kind of holding
- 14 going to affect? Your narrow alternative holding
- 15 affects just this issue. That broader reading -- I
- 16 worry about a broader reading when I don't know its
- 17 impact.
- 18 MR. SHAH: I don't think it would have -- I
- 19 think -- I don't think it would have any adverse
- 20 effects. And the reason is this: The administrative
- 21 expenses, whether they're included in the plan or not,
- 22 are still going to be paid up front. If you take
- 23 Petitioners' reading that administrative expenses are
- really part of the plan under 1222(a)(2), rather than
- 25 1226(b)(1), you now have a conflict between 1226(b)(1), 50

- 1 which is on page 10a, which expressly addresses and only
- 2 addresses administrative expenses, and states that --
- 3 this is on page 10a. It states those will be paid
- 4 "before or at the time of each payment to creditors
- 5 under the plan."
- Now, if you also said that they come under
- 7 1222(a)(2), which is the only way that Petitioners could
- 8 win -- if they also came under 1222(a)(2), 1222(a)(2)
- 9 says that their -- they must be provided for full
- 10 payment in deferred cash payments. So, deferred
- 11 interest-free payments over the life of a 3- to 5-year
- 12 bankruptcy plan. That's very different than having them
- 13 get super-priority treatment under 1226(b)(1) and be
- 14 paid in front -- up front, separate from the plan.
- So that -- that is one significant piece of
- 16 textual evidence that Congress thought that these should
- 17 be paid outside of the plan.
- 18 The other piece of textual evidence is
- 19 section 1227(a), which appears on page 10a as well, and
- 20 what it says is that the confirmed plan shall be binding
- 21 on each creditor. That's the only potentially relevant
- 22 category to the government.
- 23 But section 101 defines "creditor" -- and
- 24 this is on page 1a of our appendix -- as "entity that
- 25 has a claim against a debtor that arose at the time of  $\frac{51}{1}$

- or before the order for relief concerning the debtor."
- 2 That is a holder of a prepetition claim.
- If a confirmed chapter 12 plan is only
- 4 binding on the holder of a prepetition claim, it makes
- 5 no sense to include postpetition claims within a
- 6 chapter 12 plan. I don't even know what it would mean
- 7 to have a confirmed -- to have a plan included that and
- 8 not have that plan binding on the government.
- 9 And so, I think if you take those two pieces
- 10 of textual evidence together, I think that strongly
- 11 supports the interpretation of 1222(a)(2) that when it
- 12 says a claim of the type specified in section 507, it
- 13 means "claim" and doesn't mean "claim and administrative
- 14 expense."
- Now, admittedly, Congress has not been
- 16 perfectly clear in using that term. It uses --
- 17 sometimes it uses the term "claim" to mean claim and
- 18 administrative expense. Sometimes it means it to only
- 19 mean claim. But we should give effect to the
- 20 distinction between claim and administrative expense in
- 21 light of section 1226(b)(1), which specifically already
- 22 addresses administrative expenses.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But the problem with
- 24 that argument is that the two are used interchangeably
- 25 by everyone. Congress, the Court --

1	MR. SHAH: Yes, Your Honor.
2	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The government in many
3	situations, given the broad definition of "claims"
4	MR. SHAH: Sure.
5	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: the only logical
6	conclusion is that it includes a subset, a liability
7	created by administrative expenses.
8	MR. SHAH: Your Honor, and if you are only
9	construing that language in isolation, if it only said
10	"claim" in 507(a)(2) and 1226(b)(1) didn't exist, I
11	would be in full agreement with you that you would read
12	it to mean "claim and administrative expense." Because
13	we know that administrative expenses have to be paid in
14	some way through a bankruptcy case.
15	But 1226(b)(1) does exist in this code, and
16	we need to give that provision effect.
17	The last point I would make is Congress
18	knows how to include administrative expenses within a
19	bankruptcy plan when it wants to. If you look at the
20	corresponding provision in chapter 11, as opposed to the
21	provisions in chapter 12 and 13 this is section
22	1129(a)(9)(A) it expressly provides for the payment
23	of administrative expenses within the context of the
24	chapter 11 plan. Chapter 12 and 13 take a different
25	approach, and the Court should give effect to the choice $53$

1	that Congress made to treat administrative expenses
2	outside of the bankruptcy plan.
3	If there are no further questions?
4	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Shah.
5	MR. SHAH: Thank you, Your Honor.
6	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Ms. Freeman, you
7	have 2 minutes remaining.
8	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF SUSAN M. FREEMAN
9	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
10	MS. FREEMAN: Your Honor, one of the first
11	things that Mr. Shah said was that the debtor should
12	have set aside \$29,000 from the sale proceeds to pay the
13	taxes. That's \$29,000 in sale proceeds are property of
14	the estate. And, yes, those are ordinarily set aside to
15	pay the taxes. That's how bankruptcy cases work.
16	Because you have 1222(a)(2)(A), that \$29,000
17	didn't need to be used to pay the taxes, and instead was
18	set aside to be treated under the plan of
19	reorganization, where that tax claim could be demoted in
20	priority to a prepetition claim and discharged.
21	But the ordinary course is that the sale
22	proceeds are used to pay the taxes, the administrative
23	expenses. That's how bankruptcy works. And the
24	Government's argument here completely undercuts that.
25	With respect to section 1305, the language $54$

- 1 is different because it uses the word "payable." It
- 2 includes all postpetition, postconfirmation, all the way
- 3 through to the end of the bankruptcy case. Not just the
- 4 short period of administration.
- 5 In chapter 13 cases, you still have to pay
- 6 administrative expenses. It's just that it's pretty
- 7 rare that you have a tax that is incurred during that
- 8 short period of administration. And so, you have a
- 9 separate statute that covers the whole period through
- 10 the entirety of the plan of reorganization.
- 11 The Court was -- Mr. Shah was asked about
- 12 cases where -- and in fact an administrative expense
- 13 claim was incurred for a capital gains tax in a
- 14 chapter 12 case. We would cite the Court to the Specht
- 15 case. A copy of that is attached to the professors'
- 16 amicus brief. And that shows where a plan was defeated
- 17 because of the large capital gains tax from the sale of
- 18 the family farm. And that, in fact, is cited in some of
- 19 the -- some of the legislative -- not the legislative
- 20 history, but some of the commentary about one of the
- 21 reasons why Senator Grassley supported section
- 22 1222(a)(2)(A) and drafted it in the first place.
- This prevents a plan from being confirmed.
- 24 In so many chapter 12 cases, family farmers are not able
- to go through with their plans. And that's why you have

1	the demotion in priority.
2	It does have very little practical value if,
3	in fact, it only applies to prepetition sales and not
4	just prepetition but more than a year prepetition in
5	most instances. The professors' amicus brief just
6	refers to prepetition, and its little chart doesn't say
7	that those are not within the scope of 507(a)(8), and
8	those eighth priority I'm sorry, Your Honor.
9	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
10	The case is submitted.
11	MS. FREEMAN: Thank you.
12	(Whereupon, at 11:03 a.m., the case in the
13	above-entitled matter was submitted.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
2.5	

	I	I	i	1
A	42:10,14 43:2,9	17:11 37:5	asked 55:11	17:1,2 18:12,18
<b>Abbott</b> 14:21	43:13,17,24	50:11	asking 20:2,20	18:21,23 21:14
ability 36:2	44:2,6,10,17	answers 6:15	30:17	21:17 22:10
able 5:7 6:2	44:19 45:9 48:7	<b>anyway</b> 42:15	asset 21:19	24:7 25:15,16
55:24	48:10 50:20,23	<b>apart</b> 17:6	28:19 30:21,22	27:3 28:22,24
above-entitled	51:2 52:13,18	appeal 12:14	assets 3:20 4:12	29:9,18,25 30:2
1:11 56:13	52:20,22 53:7	APPEARANC	6:22 7:3,6,10	30:4,6,7,9,21
absolutely 43:5	53:12,13,18,23	1:14	7:11 8:15,15,25	31:5,14 32:9,10
accept 37:8 48:5	54:1,22 55:6,12	appears 41:9	9:5 12:4 13:18	39:18 40:24
accepted 19:9	administrator	51:19	22:11 24:7,9,10	41:2,11,12,21
20:5	13:11	appendix 38:21	24:25 25:19,21	42:18 44:1,11
<b>Act</b> 33:9,10,10	admittedly 31:19	41:9 46:24	29:6 36:14	44:12 47:3 50:4
38:24 39:1,20	38:17 52:15	51:24	48:23	51:12 53:14,19
39:22,24	adopt 47:5	applicable 21:25	asset's 28:23	54:2,15,23 55:3
actual 49:25	adopting 46:10	applied 12:7	assigning 18:8	<b>based</b> 25:11
additional 23:3	advantage 11:21	<b>applies</b> 11:8 15:3	Assistant 1:17	29:15 40:4
25:25	31:9 43:20,23	15:19 22:24,24	assumption	basically 5:20
address 20:19	46:9	56:3	49:22	6:7,15 19:22
addressed 19:15	adverse 50:19	<b>apply</b> 3:18 28:4	attached55:15	35:20
20:13 21:3	<b>affect</b> 50:14	31:12 38:19,24	attempt 3:12	<b>behalf</b> 2:4,7,10
addresses 51:1,2	<b>agree</b> 33:4 41:15	39:15	<b>August</b> 18:24,25	3:8 27:14 54:9
52:22	agreement 53:11	applying 40:3	authority 12:22	believe 8:19
administered	<b>Ah</b> 35:1	approach 53:25	automatically	20:10 21:4
5:18	ahead 26:25 27:2	approved30:8	47:25	benefit 28:8
administers 24:9	<b>ALITO</b> 5:12 32:3	31:6	average 49:11	<b>best</b> 14:11
administration	<b>Alito's</b> 45:17	<b>April</b> 26:14	49:12	better47:21
7:3 9:16 13:8	allege 23:4	arguably 33:23	<b>aware</b> 19:8 20:3	<b>beyond</b> 11:23
24:16 25:3,4,13	allow29:4	argue 45:5	<b>a.m</b> 1:13 3:2	50:4
25:22 26:12,19	allowed 17:9	<b>arguing</b> 44:15,18	56:12	<b>big</b> 15:23 17:17
26:22 55:4,8	35:19	argument 1:12	B	26:24 28:22
administrative	<b>allows</b> 31:23	2:2,5,8 3:3,7		30:11,13 42:6
3:16 4:16 5:5	alter28:3	16:25 19:23,25	<b>b</b> 16:10	<b>bill</b> 4:10 11:12
8:4 9:25 11:12	alternative 50:14	20:4 26:4 27:13	back 21:5 37:2,4	25:2 31:18
12:17,19,24	alters 3:14	34:2,2,3 38:1	44:20,21,25 45:1 50:8	<b>binding</b> 51:20
13:9 14:15,16	altogether 17:1	47:12 52:24		52:4,8
15:1,9,21 16:10	amend 14:7	54:8,24	bankrupt 24:1 bankruptcy 3:11	<b>bit</b> 31:10,11
16:19,23,24,25	amended 18:21	arguments 14:4	3:15,17,19,24	bite 35:7
17:7 18:4,9	amendment 15:3	19:10	4:11 5:11 6:20	boat 28:20,21
19:1,2,3,5,6,11	amicus 12:8	arises 30:6		48:19
19:24 20:8,13	32:16,17 49:14	arising 30:10	6:22,25 7:1,7 8:5,21,24 9:2,5	Brenda 5:17
20:17,18 26:18	55:16 56:5	<b>Arizona</b> 1:15	9:16 10:17	<b>BREYER</b> 10:3
27:23,24 33:18	amount 30:13	arose 16:15,16	11:15,15 12:1	10:25 11:4,6
34:1,4,7,16,20	35:18	51:25	13:3,4,13 15:13	14:2,19,21,24
35:15 36:1,4,7	anchor 40:25	aside 30:24	15:20 16:19	15:24 16:2,5,8
37:9,11,14 42:4	answer 11:9	54:12,14,18	13.20 10.17	17:11,15,19
	1	1	'	

				5
18:7,11 34:8,11	39:18 40:23	26:19 27:5,5,21	52:19,20 53:10	complies 0:19 19
34:14,19,22	41:11 42:3,8	27:21 28:3,13	53:12 54:19,20	complies 9:18,18 10:1
35:2,4 36:4,23	47:2,6 49:2,3	29:2 33:3,7	55:13	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,		component 29:15
42:11,20,24	49:12,13,21,23	35:24 36:11,13	claimed 7:24	compute 5:22
43:4,7,15	50:3 53:14 55:3	36:16 37:1	claims 5:10 15:8	concerning 7:18
<b>brief</b> 12:8 32:17	55:14,15 56:10	41:23 42:3,5,17	15:16,25 16:9	52:1
32:17 34:3	56:12	42:25 43:2	16:20,23,24	conclusion 53:6
41:10 45:1	cases 3:15,15,18	46:11,16,19,20	19:20 20:14	confirm 50:1
49:14,19 55:16	12:1,10 15:20	46:22,22 47:19	28:2 31:25 33:2	confirmation 4:3
56:5	18:3 19:9,13	47:21 48:15,16	36:6,20 52:5	4:14 24:17
<b>broad</b> 20:23 21:2	20:11,19 25:17	48:24 49:2,3,7	53:3	49:20
25:14 53:3	25:24 31:5	49:8,12,13,16	clear 21:19 30:18	confirmed 26:13
broader 16:16	32:18,19,20	49:21,23,25	49:15 52:16	36:18,22,24
26:2 27:4 50:12	41:24,25 48:15	50:12 52:3,6	clerk 3:23	51:20 52:3,7
50:15,16	48:16,24 49:8	53:20,21,24,24	<b>close</b> 10:13	55:23
business 29:4	54:15 55:5,12	55:5,14,24	<b>code</b> 3:17 6:11	conflict 50:25
43:10	55:24	<b>chart</b> 32:18,19	7:1,16 13:3,4	Congress 21:12
	<b>cash</b> 51:10	56:6	14:7 15:13	31:4 32:6,24,25
C	categories 35:5	<b>Chief</b> 3:3,9 11:17	16:13,19 18:18	38:11,13,19,22
<b>C</b> 2:1 3:1	category 36:12	11:25 12:11	18:21 22:1,4	39:3 40:2 42:7
<b>call</b> 34:12,16	51:22	27:9,12,15	33:9,14,16,19	45:11,13,16,20
calling 16:23	cause 15:15,19	28:16 29:19	34:17 41:8,21	49:16,18 50:2,6
capital 4:24 5:4	central 28:19	30:11 44:14	42:25 44:7	50:7,8 51:16
5:22,24 21:21	certain 9:22	45:4,7,15 46:8	46:15 48:5	52:15,25 53:17
28:11 30:10,23	31:24 33:2	48:17,21 49:7	49:25 53:15	54:1
30:25 31:6 32:7	certainly 11:14	54:4,6 56:9	codified 39:24	consider 37:16
32:10 48:22,25	12:2 21:4 30:3	choice 53:25	40:11	considerable
55:13,17	32:25 37:11	choice 33.23 chosen 33:24	collect 26:25	12:15
carry 9:23	44:14	circuit 19:8 26:6	44:10,12	considered 29:25
case 3:4,19 5:3	cetera 7:24	26:7 29:11	collection 23:19	consist 3:21
5:16,19 7:17	change 19:4,15	cite 32:19 38:14	23:20	consisted 22:11
8:21 9:5,16,17	_			
10:4,4 11:15,15	29:7,16 48:12	41:15 42:3	<b>come</b> 35:7 37:13	consistent 6:7,21
12:4,13,25 13:3	50:8,9	55:14	39:16 51:6	13:2 27:20
13:6,17 16:23	<b>changed</b> 45:13	cited 18:14 41:24	comes 10:19	45:12
17:2 18:24	45:16	44:25 49:19	33:7 47:21	consistently
21:17 22:3,15	chapter 3:14,19	55:18	coming 35:14	16:21 44:5 45:2
22:23 23:22	7:20 9:17 10:6	<b>claim</b> 12:19	commencement	consists 3:20
	11:14 12:1,3,8	14:13 15:5,6,6	22:3	6:22 24:7
24:4,22 25:16	12:9 15:20	16:3,7,13,15	commentary	construe 3:16
25:18,20,23,23	17:13 19:10,20	16:16 17:10	55:20	construing 53:9
26:11 27:5,18	22:16,16,24,25	26:18 27:2,3	commissions	consummated
29:11,11,14,15	23:3,7,24,25	28:15 35:25	26:24	40:2
30:6,6,21,21	24:4,19,19,20	36:1 47:1,3	Committee 39:2	contains 22:22
30:24 32:16	24:22 25:16,18	51:25 52:2,4,12	compared 48:18	27:25
36:17 37:1,13	25:22,23,23,24	52:13,13,17,17	completely 54:24	context 29:25
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>

	1	1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
31:12 40:20,24	16:20,22 17:4	38:16	53:3	<b>drag</b> 12:2
53:23	25:4,12 27:16	<b>debt</b> 10:7,20	<b>Delphi</b> 11:15	<b>draws</b> 10:13
continue 43:10	30:9 36:3 41:14	17:10,25 27:20	15:23	<b>due</b> 11:13
43:11	52:25 53:25	31:1	demoted 5:8	<b>duty</b> 41:6,16,17
continued 13:5	55:11,14	<b>debtor</b> 5:7,14,15	54:19	<b>D.C</b> 1:8,18
continues 24:11	<b>courts</b> 20:3 21:3	6:11 7:8,12,14	demotes 5:6	
25:5	40:8,8 50:4	7:18,24 8:13,14	demotion 56:1	E
contrary 6:12	Court's 13:2	9:11,16 11:21	<b>Department</b> 1:18	E 2:1 3:1,1
control 13:13	cover27:22	22:12,13,17,18	designed 29:4	earn 5:7 10:10
22:20	<b>covered</b> 28:2,13	22:25 23:8,9,25	44:22	24:12
convenience	covers 55:9	24:18,19,20,20	determine 40:6	earned3:22
3:23	create 7:21	24:24,25 25:8	detriment 48:15	24:15 26:24
converted 39:8	created 7:17	27:1 30:20	difference 6:3	earnings 23:10
<b>copy</b> 55:15	53:7	31:24 39:23	23:18 42:12,13	earns 22:12 24:5
corn 29:22	creditor 16:14	48:15 49:17	42:16 43:15,18	27:1
corporate 3:14	51:21,23	51:25 52:1	different 19:16	easily 45:25
15:20 22:16	creditors 12:21	54:11	41:7 45:7 51:12	effect 3:13 13:12
23:7,10 24:18	51:4	debtors 23:8	53:24 55:1	25:5 46:11,14
24:19 25:20	critical 46:7	debtor's 8:2,3	differently 33:23	46:15 47:11
40:20 41:12,16	<b>crop</b> 5:21 12:6	debtor-in-poss	33:25 42:23	52:19 53:16,25
41:24	<b>crops</b> 3:24	13:7,10,15,20	43:5	effects 50:20
corporation 8:8	curiae 12:8	13:21 22:19	difficulties 47:11	eight 32:19,20
41:13	current 47:22	23:21 25:14	disadvantage	eighth 18:19,22
<b>correct</b> 5:2 7:22	D	<b>debts</b> 3:25 4:4,6	44:7,8	36:20 56:8
8:1	-	4:6 10:10,12,15	discharge 5:7	either 28:20
correctly 32:1	<b>D</b> 1:3 3:1	10:20 12:5 17:8	9:10,12,12,17	45:10
40:20	dairy 29:22	17:9,16,21	9:20,21,22,25	elect 26:23
corresponding	date 3:21 4:3,7	19:10 27:22,23	13:22	election 26:8,10
53:20	4:13 6:23 7:4 22:12 24:8,17	28:3 46:5 50:13	dischargeable	eligible 49:6
Costello 14:22	<i>'</i>	decided 38:25	27:19	employee 37:9
costs 37:15,15	24:17 25:20	deciding 30:12	discharged 5:9	employment
counsel 6:4	<b>Dating</b> 44:25 45:1	deductions 8:3,4	13:23 54:20	33:20,21,22 37:16
50:10 56:9	= '	deemed 34:4	discharges 17:8	
count 6:2	days 26:13 49:25 50:1	defeated 55:16	discretion 33:24	enact 45:25
counterintuitive	dead 48:4	<b>defend</b> 20:21	dismissed 12:25	enacted 38:6,19
28:25		deference 33:10	<b>dispute</b> 33:5,6,8	43:22 49:23 50:7
County 4:21	<b>deadlines</b> 49:25 50:5	33:12	disputing 30:4	entire 18:24 32:8
<b>couple</b> 32:13		deferred 51:10	disruption 47:19	
50:5	deal 6:2,4 14:3	51:10	distinction 52:20	34:17
course 7:2 9:15	30:12	<b>define</b> 38:4,8	doing 15:12 37:6	entirely 40:25 entirety 55:10
11:7 12:18 18:1	<b>dealing</b> 4:24 13:24	<b>defined</b> 16:13,14	domestic 35:10	entities 38:20
18:5 25:22	deals 8:20 9:14	34:17	36:7	entitled 33:2
43:21 54:21	24:11 25:25	defines 51:23	doubt 32:1	
court 1:1,12 3:10		definition 32:22	drafted38:24	entity 6:10,24
3:16 13:6,10,17	<b>dealt</b> 30:7,19	34:6 37:12,14	55:22	7:5 22:2,6,8,9
	1	ı	l	<u> </u>

				0
22:10,17 23:14	exception 11:7	51:1 53:22	<b>filed</b> 5:13,14	25:6,10 26:9
23:18 24:2	17:6 21:25	extended 40:2	18:23,25	27:10,11 54:6,8
38:15,18 39:7	22:22,23 23:3,5	50:2,4	files 8:22 22:18	54:10 56:11
39:18,22 40:19	23:6 24:3 28:1	extending 11:22	23:8 24:24	<b>front</b> 42:19 44:1
41:3,20 49:24	exceptions 9:21	extent 32:24	<b>filing</b> 3:21 4:1,3	44:9 48:8 50:22
51:24	23:24		4:13 6:23 7:4	51:14,14
<b>ESQ</b> 1:15,17 2:3	exist 8:16,25	<b>F</b>	18:22 22:11	<b>full</b> 36:2,5,21
2:6,9	25:19 53:10,15	<b>fact</b> 11:11 12:19	24:8,17 25:20	51:9 53:11
estate 3:19,24	existed 3:20	20:16 35:25	40:22 46:3 48:1	<b>fully</b> 35:9,10
4:5,9,11,12	expect 38:23	42:1,19 45:21	49:4	38:23,23
5:11,13,15 6:10	expected 42:8	55:12,18 56:3	<b>filings</b> 46:19,20	<b>fund</b> 13:25
6:11,22 7:2,2	49:20 50:6	failed 20:7	finish 37:6 50:11	fundamental
7:10,17,21 8:5	expense 5:5	<b>fair</b> 25:7	<b>finite</b> 36:14	3:14
8:7,13,15,25	12:19 13:9	<b>fairly</b> 10:5 29:20	<b>first</b> 3:4 17:12,13	further 54:3
9:2,5,7 10:17	15:21 26:18	<b>fall</b> 26:15 28:3,14	27:20 29:9	<b>future</b> 10:19
12:2 13:11,14	33:19 34:5,7	family 55:18,24	32:14 33:8 36:8	17:21
13:18 21:9,9,12	35:15 36:1	<b>farm</b> 3:13 4:25	36:20 45:10	
21:19,23 22:10	37:14 42:5,10	5:5,8 9:24 10:5	54:10 55:22	G
22:14,16 23:9	42:14 43:9 48:7	10:8,18 20:12	fishermen 28:18	<b>G</b> 3:1
23:12,16,18,19	48:10 52:14,18	21:20 23:11	44:22 45:19	<b>gain</b> 5:1
24:1,6,6,7,13	52:20 53:12	28:1,6,7,19,21	focused 31:8,16	gains 4:24 5:4,23
24:18,21,22,25	55:12	29:6,17,21	followed 20:11	5:24 21:21
25:8,9,11 26:25	expenses 4:11	30:20,22 32:8,8	following 34:8	28:11 30:10,23
27:3 34:5,20	8:4 9:25 11:12	48:18 55:18	35:22	31:1,7 32:8,10
35:21 37:12,15	12:17,18 14:15	farmer 20:16	footnote 34:3	48:22,25 55:13
37:20,21,23	14:16 15:2,8,9	29:16 30:14	forma 5:23	55:17
38:5 39:10,23	15:11,15,17	farmers 28:18	forth 5:22 34:2	gap 40:5,10
40:7 41:2,5,12	16:10,19 17:1,7	29:4,5,21 31:9	39:21	gather 29:20
41:21 42:1	18:4 19:1,2,3,5	44:23 45:19	framework 31:22	General 1:18
49:18 54:14	19:6,11,24 20:8	55:24	Freeman 1:15	11:16
estates 3:11	20:14,18 21:18	<b>farming</b> 29:5,7	2:3,9 3:6,7,9	generally 12:10
25:15	25:3 27:23,24	29:17	4:2,8,16,20 5:2	generate 3:12
estate's 9:8	28:13 34:1,16	fault 14:8	5:15 6:6,14,18	generated21:17
35:20	34:20 35:20	favorable 43:25	7:14,19,22 8:1	30:22
et 1:3 7:24	36:5,8 37:9,11	featured 26:6	8:14,19 9:11	generates 21:20
everybody 11:24	43:3,13,17,24	<b>Federal</b> 4:21 6:8	10:23 11:3,5,10	generating 25:21
31:8,16	44:3,6,10,17	6:21,25,25 7:9	11:25 12:13	<b>getting</b> 12:6 35:8
evidence 31:17	44:19 45:9	35:11,14,19	14:18,20 15:18	GINSBURG
51:16,18 52:10	50:21,23 51:2	38:25 40:3,12	16:1,4,7,12	4:15,18,23 26:4
exactly 18:15	52:22 53:7,13	43:8	17:14,18 18:4,9	28:6 33:20
29:24 31:17	53:18,23 54:1	fertilizer 10:11	18:14 19:13,18	45:23
47:1	54:23 55:6	<b>file</b> 5:12,17 7:8	19:21 20:1,6,9	<b>give</b> 10:10 20:7
<b>example</b> 4:9,22	explaining 29:16	26:12 27:2 41:5	20:22 21:1,7,10	52:19 53:16,25
29:10	explanation 39:3	41:6,16,22	21:15 22:7 23:1	<b>given</b> 8:7 11:9
excepted 9:22	expressly 49:18	46:25 47:3	23:5,17 24:3	37:7 53:3
	-			

	I	I		
gives 21:6 26:2,8	H	I	21:14,15 25:7,9	45:14 52:11
27:4	Hall 1:3 3:4 5:17	idea 30:14 39:6,8	25:10,12,13,13	interpreted
<b>go</b> 11:19 14:12	21:19	ignore 31:2	26:16 28:12	16:21 19:14
17:20 21:5	<b>Halls</b> 18:23	imagine 43:4	34:5,20,23	interpreting
26:25 27:2	Hall's 3:22	<b>impact</b> 20:13	37:12,20,21,23	46:13
28:22 29:12,18	happen 29:5 30:8	50:11,17	38:5 39:10 40:6	intervening 40:1
44:11 47:2 50:8	happens 10:3	impacts 21:2	42:1 49:3,17	invoke 47:7
55:25	11:14 17:12	implemented	55:7,13	<b>involve</b> 19:23,24
<b>goes</b> 10:6 46:7	18:2 30:4	38:15	incurring 4:10	32:20
<b>going</b> 7:8,10,12	<b>hard</b> 8:6	important 21:23	24:20	involved 29:12
8:2 10:8 13:22	<b>harm</b> 15:15,19	26:10 46:17	<b>incurs</b> 23:16	involves 19:10
17:20 19:7	Hartford 16:22	imposed 8:8,9	41:18,18	19:20
25:18,20 26:14	head 39:14 44:17	9:8	independent	involving 32:18
26:17,17 28:23	heads 39:6,8	imposes 41:21	24:5	<b>IRS</b> 6:1 33:24
30:1,12,14	hear 3:3	inapt 41:25	independently	39:17,20 40:3
31:14 35:12	heaven's 11:1	include 3:25 5:24	22:12,13	40:20
36:17 50:14,22	held 25:4 41:14	8:4 15:16 16:6	indicate 31:20	isolation 53:9
government	help 44:22	52:5 53:18	individual 7:8	issue 21:6 27:18
15:10 17:23	helps 11:23	included 28:7	13:18,19 20:16	28:5,22 29:13
19:8 26:2,8,10	<b>high</b> 31:6	47:3 50:21 52:7	22:25 23:25	30:15 31:1
26:16,21 27:4	highest 13:1	includes 5:20	24:4,5,7,11,20	37:13 47:2
35:19 43:8,25	history 38:13	14:16 26:1 53:6	42:13	48:22 50:15
44:3,9 45:2,12	49:15,19 55:20	55:2	individually 8:23	issues 9:14
46:9,25 47:2,6	holder 52:2,4	including 15:1	9:3,4	<b>I.D</b> 6:24
47:20,25 48:1	holding 50:13,14	16:9,20 17:5,9	individuals 34:25	
48:13 51:22	Holywell 41:14	27:23	instance 11:16	J
52:8 53:2	Honor 4:8,20 5:2	income 3:12,22	43:10	January 10:5
governmental	5:19 6:6,14 8:1	4:12 5:21 7:2	instances 17:15	18:25
31:25	8:20 10:24 11:3	7:23 9:1 10:19	24:14 56:5	<b>Joe</b> 10:18
government's	11:10 12:13	17:21 21:16,20	intended21:12	jurisdiction 39:2
3:12 16:25	15:18 16:12	21:22 22:12	21:13 22:22	<b>Justice</b> 1:18 3:3
18:16,17 19:9	20:10 21:1,7	24:5,12,12,15	32:6,25 46:13	3:9,25 4:6,15
19:19 20:11	22:7 23:6,17	24:21 25:21	46:15 47:19	4:18,23 5:12
30:19 41:9,10	24:4 26:9 28:10	26:18 27:17	<b>intent</b> 31:20 50:7	6:4,9,15,18
43:20,23 44:7	29:1 30:3,17	39:25 41:13	interchangeably	7:12,15,20,23
45:1 46:24	31:15 32:14	49:1	52:24	8:6,17 9:7 10:3
47:22 54:24	33:22 34:21	incorporated	interesting 18:16	10:25 11:4,6,17
Grassley 11:7	35:3 36:9 37:10	13:4	interest-free	12:1,11 14:2,19
14:5 28:8 31:19	38:12 39:14	incur 3:11 4:9	51:11	14:21,24 15:24
32:1,4 33:11	41:1 43:19	21:10,15 22:5	Internal 7:16	16:2,5,8 17:11
46:13 55:21	44:24 48:3	24:9 35:6 41:2	22:1 41:8	17:15,19 18:7
Grassley's 31:19	49:10 53:1,8	41:19	interpret 41:23	18:11 19:7,16
great 14:3	54:5,10 56:8	incurred 4:1,4,7	interpretation	19:19,22 20:2,7
guidance 40:5,11	hornbook 18:12	4:11 13:7,8	20:12 32:4	20:20,23 21:5,8
	hornbooks 18:15	20:15 21:8,12	33:13 44:8	21:11,24 22:21
	1011100005 10.13	20.13 21.0,12		

				0
23:2,13,23 25:6	32:15	limit 3:12	36:25 46:12	24:3,13 42:18
26:4 27:9,12,15	32.13	limited 27:22	56:13	53:16 54:17
28:6,16 29:19	L	line 8:7 44:18,20	mean 11:17	needed 23:24
30:11 31:3 32:3	language 6:13	44:21	17:12 19:2	never 39:8 47:6
33:20 34:8,11	25:11 37:20,21	liquidated 36:15	23:13,15 30:13	new 12:6
34:14,19,22	39:9 46:2 53:9	liquidation 36:14	32:7 42:12,20	Nicholas 13:3,6
35:2,4 36:4,23	54:25	literally 35:6	43:5,7 47:20	13:17 25:5,12
37:2,4,25 38:4	large 11:14	little 31:10,11	52:6,13,17,19	Ninth 26:6
38:10 39:5	40:24 48:22	32:5 56:2,6	53:12	nonpriority
40:14,17 42:11	55:17	livestock 29:7	meaning 19:6	27:20 46:5
42:20,24 43:4,7	larger 32:23	loaned 10:18	33:19	non-discharge
43:15 44:14	lasted 12:14	local 6:12,16,20	means 16:15	46:4
45:4,7,15,17	Laughter 14:23	7:9,25 38:17,20	19:15 23:15	normal 27:5
45:23 46:8 47:9	law7:7,9,25	39:15,25	39:2 52:13,18	November 1:9
47:16,24 48:17	18:12	logic 8:11	median 49:14	null 32:14
48:21 49:7	lead 33:17	logical 53:5	members 8:10	number 6:24
50:10 52:23	leading 44:4	long 12:9,11	minutes 54:7	18:14 35:16,16
53:2,5 54:4,6	<b>leads</b> 45:9	42:14	misunderstand	numerous 16:18
56:9	leases 12:5	longer 12:3,3	36:10	
	leave 15:14	50:6	money 10:18	0
K	<b>left</b> 15:10	look 10:19 15:7	13:16 17:20	<b>O</b> 2:1 3:1
<b>KAGAN</b> 25:6	legislative 38:13	18:11,13 40:21	35:9 36:6 45:10	obligation 41:21
31:3 37:25 38:4	40:11 49:15,19	46:22 53:19	moneys 9:14	43:8
38:10 39:5	55:19,19	looked 40:9	month 26:13	obligations 35:10
40:14,17 47:9	legislator 31:18	looking 8:12	months 31:14	36:7
47:16,24	letter48:4	34:11 40:18	49:12,14 50:2,6	obviously 28:8
KENNEDY 3:25	<b>let's</b> 35:9 43:4	looks 17:4 40:21	morning 3:4	occasion 47:7
4:6 9:7	liabilities 21:17	loosely 35:21	<b>Motors</b> 11:16	occur 48:16
key 15:10	32:19,21 33:18	losing 40:24	move 12:23	occurred32:11
kind 11:23 14:14	41:25 45:3	lot 10:7,12 30:16	moves 30:20	<b>odd</b> 31:10,11,11
15:1,6 25:11	48:14	31:11 34:12	movie 14:22	officer 13:10
26:3 39:6 48:1	liability 13:24	lottery 20:15		<b>oh</b> 17:25 42:22
50:13	17:10 21:16,21	23:10	N	Okay 19:18
<b>kinds</b> 10:11	21:21 22:13	Lynwood 1:3	<b>N</b> 2:1,1 3:1	20:22 35:4 36:9
25:15	24:10 27:17	5:17	<b>name</b> 11:1	36:23 38:3
knew32:25	28:5 29:13,15		narrow50:14	ones 8:23 49:8
know 6:2 10:11	30:19,23 33:7	M	narrower32:22	<b>open</b> 50:5
11:16 15:12	42:4,9 43:12	<b>M</b> 1:15 2:3,9 3:7	32:24	operated 23:20
29:22 31:14	53:6	54:8	narrowly 46:13	33:1
42:21,21 49:22	<b>liable</b> 8:8 9:3,4,8	maintained45:6	necessarily	operating 4:9,10
50:16 52:6	9:9 35:17 41:18	making 31:9	16:15	10:9 12:16
53:13	<b>life</b> 51:11	managed31:13	necessary 8:18	21:18
knows 53:18	<b>light</b> 4:9 11:12	matter 1:11 7:7	18:7 37:15	operation 4:4
Knudsen 5:19	25:2 34:15	13:22 29:2	47:13	29:8,17 33:11
29:11,11,12	35:16 52:21	33:23 36:11,13	need 12:5 20:17	46:16 47:19

				6
48:13	40:10 43:1	perfectly 52:16	<b>plans</b> 55:25	9:22 10:20
operational	parcel 37:18	period 4:2,13,17	<b>plan's</b> 30:12	16:15,17 17:21
43:18	part 3:23 17:2	7:3 11:13 12:15	please 3:10	18:19,20 19:10
operations 29:22	23:11 24:6,21	12:16,17 13:8	27:16	19:20 27:22
opposed 53:20	29:21 31:20	18:20,24 24:16	<b>point</b> 11:4 14:8	28:11,12 29:14
<b>option</b> 26:21	32:8 33:9,9	25:3,13 26:12	21:16 30:5	31:25 32:10,21
oral 1:11 2:2,5	34:6 37:17 38:1	26:15,19,20,22	32:23 34:15	32:22 33:3
3:7 27:13	44:1 50:24	26:23 55:4,8,9	37:22 53:17	50:13 52:2,4
<b>order</b> 36:21	particular 5:3	<b>permit</b> 31:22	points 29:1	54:20 56:3,4,4
43:11 52:1	9:24 18:16	person 13:13,24	position 11:21	56:6
ordering 36:25	39:20 48:22	14:1 31:17	18:17 20:21,24	prescient 38:11
ordinarily 54:14	particularly	personally 35:18	26:5,7 28:23	38:13
ordinary 12:18	44:22	perspective	30:1 33:15	presented 20:4
18:5 43:20	partner8:24	46:18	43:23 44:4,5,15	preserve 29:23
54:21	partners 8:9,22	<b>petition</b> 4:3,13	45:3,5,12 46:10	preserving 37:15
originally 38:24	9:9	6:23 7:4 22:11	47:5,22,23	presume 40:9
outside 8:21 17:1	partnership 8:9	24:8,16 25:19	postbankruptcy	<b>pretend</b> 30:15,18
20:4,9 28:24	8:20,21,22	46:4 49:4,5	19:12	<b>pretty</b> 17:17 55:6
29:8 30:1 32:9	passed 38:22	Petitioner 47:13	postconfirmati	prevents 55:23
32:9,11 42:17	pay 7:5,7,13 8:13	Petitioners 1:4	26:2 55:2	previous 32:12
44:11,12 51:17	8:23,24 9:2,5	1:16 2:4,10 3:8	postpetition 9:23	pre-existing
54:2	13:15,15,18	29:12 41:24	11:22 17:16,25	31:21 33:9,13
owed33:11,12	19:11 21:9	42:2 46:10 47:5	24:12 26:1	33:15 39:19
owns 24:8	30:25 35:9,10	47:22 48:5	27:17,23,24	40:4
	41:5,17,22	50:23 51:7 54:9	28:4 29:13	<b>pre-1</b> 10:7
P	43:12 54:12,15	Phoenix 1:15	31:21 32:7,18	<b>price</b> 30:23,25
<b>P</b> 3:1	54:17,22 55:5	phrase 38:7	33:7,18 35:6,9	principle 3:14
<b>page</b> 2:2 32:17	payable 4:12	39:10	41:25 42:3,9	<b>prior</b> 39:17
32:20 38:21	12:18 13:9	piece 51:15,18	43:8 45:3 47:1	priorities 5:5
41:10 46:23	15:23 25:8 26:1	pieces 52:9	48:14 49:1,6	17:23 18:8
48:4 51:1,3,19	46:3 55:1	place 33:8 55:22	52:5 55:2	36:11,25
51:24	payment 9:13,14	<b>plan</b> 4:3,14 5:9	potatoes 48:18	<b>priority</b> 3:17 5:6
pages 45:1	12:22,23,23	9:19 10:2 17:5	potential 11:22	5:8 10:21,23
<b>paid</b> 11:13 12:20	16:14 19:3 51:4	17:8 24:17	34:3	11:1,2,5 12:24
12:24 13:1	51:10 53:22	26:13,23 27:21	potentially 51:21	13:2,9 17:24
14:25 17:2,7,20	payments 9:15	28:3,4,13 31:5	practical 29:2	18:10,19,19,22
18:5,6,7,10	15:1 25:1,1,2	33:3,8 36:11,17	32:5 47:11,17	20:8,17 28:2,13
20:18 27:3,24	51:10,11	36:18,22,24	56:2	28:15 31:24
35:15 36:2,5,15	payroll 37:16	42:18 47:4 50:1	practice 34:12	33:1,2 35:15,25
36:21 37:17	pays 6:11 7:14	50:21,24 51:5	40:4 47:20 50:3	36:1,8,12,16
42:15,18 44:1,9	8:14 24:10	51:12,14,17,20	<b>PRATIK</b> 1:17	36:19,20,20
46:5 48:8 50:22	people 10:10	52:3,6,7,8	2:6 27:13	37:7 43:22 48:8
51:3,14,17	31:13 34:23	53:19,24 54:2	preceded 13:3	48:10,11 54:20
53:13	35:5	54:18 55:10,16	preceding 8:12	56:1,8
parallel 39:15	<b>people's</b> 39:6,7	55:23	prepetition 5:10	<b>pro</b> 5:10,23
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	1	1	1	i
problem 14:12	<b>put</b> 11:7 23:4	54:8	18:16 40:12	11:17 12:11
21:1,24 31:8,16	46:18 49:24	receive 42:19	54:25	27:9,12 28:16
42:6 47:10,17	<b>puts</b> 44:17,20,21	received 12:7,22	respectfully	29:19 30:11
52:23		12:23	11:25 15:18	44:14 45:4,7,15
procedure 46:25	Q	receives 9:12,17	23:17	48:17,21 49:7
<b>Procedures</b> 6:1	qualifies 32:16	9:19	<b>Respondent</b> 1:19	54:4,6 56:9
proceedings 10:8	question 6:16	reduction 35:18	2:7 27:14	roughly 50:1
proceeds 3:24	11:8,18 17:12	35:22	responses 32:13	rules 38:15,18
5:21 23:11	17:22 19:17	<b>refer</b> 16:19	responsibility	38:18 39:14,21
54:12,13,22	30:9 35:13 37:3	reference 38:5	13:21	39:24 45:13,16
process 10:21,24	37:5 40:15,21	referred 16:23	responsible	49:16,24 50:9
professors 12:9	45:17 46:8	referring 39:11	13:19,20,23	<b>ruling</b> 39:20 40:4
32:16 49:13	50:11	refers 14:15 15:3	41:4	40:9
55:15 56:5	questions 54:3	15:9 25:16 56:6	rest 10:1	rulings 39:17
proper 33:13	<b>queue</b> 10:22	rejected 12:6	restructured	40:10
properly 37:22	<b>quick</b> 11:23	relative 36:12	12:5	<b>run</b> 10:10,12,16
<b>property</b> 4:22 9:1	quickly 11:20	relatively 49:20	result 14:9 22:2	17:16
21:22 23:19,20	15:5 49:9,21	relevant 37:13	23:15 31:7,22	
24:18,21 31:13	R	37:22,22 51:21	33:17 40:12	S
54:13		relief 52:1	45:10 46:12	<b>S</b> 2:1 3:1
propose 50:1	<b>R</b> 3:1	remainder 27:7	return 5:13,18	sale 3:13 4:24
proposed 36:17	rare 55:7	remaining 54:7	5:20,24 7:9 8:2	5:1,6,8,21 9:24
protection 45:19	rata 5:10	remarkable 42:2	8:22-23:9 40:22	20:12 23:11
provide 26:9	reach 31:20	reorganization	41:5,7,12,16	28:1,12 29:6
32:17 45:19	read 6:9 15:16	5:9,16 9:19	41:22	30:8,22,23,25
provided 17:9	16:8 19:24 21:8	10:2 22:15	returns 22:18	31:7 32:8 48:18
18:18 39:3 51:9	22:22 31:11	23:21 29:3	24:25	48:22 54:12,13
provides 7:16	39:11 47:23	54:19 55:10	revenue 7:16	54:21 55:17
9:24 22:1 46:25	53:11	reorganize 29:6	22:1 39:20 40:4	sales 12:4 28:7,7
53:22	readily 40:8	representative	41:8	28:11 29:10
provision 5:6	reading 15:25	32:18	rewrite 50:9	56:3
14:7 15:19,21	37:8 48:6,7	reprinted 38:21	<b>right</b> 7:19 10:25	save 28:21 29:8
18:15 22:22	50:12,15,16,23	reproduced	14:6,7 15:12	29:17
25:25 29:3,3	real 39:11 45:19	46:23	16:1,4,13 17:14	saying 6:13
32:4 38:20 41:7	really 13:4,21	required 17:7	19:21 26:3,23	17:23,24,25
44:21 46:1	16:24 21:3	44:7	34:25 35:22	19:20,23 21:13
53:16,20	25:14 27:4	requirements	37:10 43:5	31:2 34:22
provisions 9:13	45:17 50:24	17:5	44:15 45:24	35:24 36:10
9:18 10:1 13:22	reason 22:9 31:3	requires 3:15	47:14 48:19	37:8 39:5 45:16
16:18 17:4 26:5	43:24 46:17	13:13	49:9	says 7:15 9:7
33:9,14,16	48:3,6 49:16	reserve 27:7	rights 27:4	14:13,25 15:6
37:23 38:6,6	50:20	resolve 31:1	<b>rip</b> 48:4	15:10 16:3 17:6
43:2 53:21	reasons 27:20	resolved 49:9	<b>ripple</b> 46:11	17:8 22:23
<b>pull</b> 38:25 43:2,3	55:21	respect 6:16	47:11	24:22 26:16
purposes 10:17	<b>rebuttal</b> 2:8 27:8	11:21 17:5	ROBERTS 3:3	30:1 41:11 47:2
	l		l	

51:9,20 52:12	28:17 30:16	<b>ship</b> 10:6,9	50:10 52:23	submitted 56:10
<b>SCALIA</b> 21:24	33:1 52:5	<b>shoes</b> 39:1	53:2,5	56:13
22:21 23:2,13	sent 5:25	<b>short</b> 18:20	Sotomayor's	subset 28:2
23:23	sentence 8:11,18	26:12,15,20	37:3	31:24 53:6
<b>scope</b> 56:7	8:19	55:4,8	speak 45:20	subsidies 12:7
second 36:8	separate 5:23	show 35:13 42:11	<b>Specht</b> 55:14	subtract 10:20
section 3:13,16	6:10,23,24 7:17	47:16	special 5:25	suggest 40:18
3:17 6:5,6,20	7:21 9:13 10:16	<b>shown</b> 5:19	42:19 46:25	suggested 45:17
7:1,6 8:12	22:2,6,8,9,14	<b>shows</b> 12:9 47:12	specific 25:24	suggesting 39:9
13:12 15:22	23:14 24:13	55:16	specifically	super-priority
16:13 17:8,9	38:15,18 39:7	sides 33:4 41:15	52:21	48:8 51:13
18:18 19:14	39:17,21 40:19	41:15	specified 14:14	support 35:10
22:1,10,24 23:7	41:3,20 45:25	significant 29:14	15:6 52:12	36:7
24:22 25:25	49:24 51:14	32:21 46:10,15	<b>split</b> 19:8 20:25	supported 55:21
27:18,25 28:1	55:9	47:10,17,18	start 15:13	supports 52:11
28:14,15 31:9	separately 13:23	48:12,23 51:15	started 47:14	suppose 4:25
31:23 32:2,25	27:25	similar 4:25	<b>State</b> 4:18,19,21	42:12,12
33:4,11,16,16	set 6:24 30:24	simply 17:3	4:25 5:3,12 6:7	<b>Supreme</b> 1:1,12
33:17 34:24,24	32:15,15 34:2,2	39:13 46:11	6:11,16,20 7:9	<b>sure</b> 31:9,15 38:9
34:24,25 38:16	36:14,21 38:17	simultaneously	7:25 38:17,19	40:16 42:16
39:14,24 41:8	39:21 49:16	37:17	39:15,25	43:19 48:25
43:21 46:2,7,22	54:12,14,18	single 7:4,5 22:8	statements	53:4
51:19,23 52:12	settle 35:8	22:17 42:3,8	31:20	SUSAN 1:15 2:3
52:21 53:21	<b>Shah</b> 1:17 2:6	situation 20:5,10	states 1:1,6,12	2:9 3:7 54:8
54:25 55:21	27:12,13,15	29:20	3:5 22:4 51:2,3	
sections 37:24	28:10 29:1 30:3	situations 53:3	statistics 49:11	T
see 14:11 16:20	30:17 31:4,15	sloughed 15:4	<b>statute</b> 3:13 9:24	<b>T</b> 2:1,1
27:1 29:8 34:15	32:13 33:22	small 32:15	20:12 31:12	take 21:16 31:9
seek 33:25	34:10,13,18,21	48:18	39:12 55:9	35:21 39:10
seeking 48:13	35:1,3,23 36:9	<b>Smith</b> 10:18	statutory 31:21	43:23 46:9
seen 49:11	36:24 37:10	<b>sold</b> 21:20	39:9 50:5	50:22 52:9
self-denying	38:1,3,9,12	solely 45:9	stayed45:12	53:24
44:3,15	39:13 40:16	Solicitor 1:17	step 39:1 40:2	taken21:18 35:6
sell 29:7,21,23	41:1 42:16,22	somebody 6:1	stop 15:22	45:2
30:20 31:13	42:25 43:6,14	<b>sorry</b> 56:8	<b>store</b> 3:23	talked 15:5
selling 3:24	43:19 44:24	sort 23:3 29:24	straddle 18:23	talking 15:5
24:10	45:6,11,20,25	32:14 38:2	<b>strip</b> 31:24 33:1	28:17,18 36:16
<b>sells</b> 24:9	47:15,18 48:2	44:16	stripped43:22	45:4 49:12
Senator 11:7	48:20,25 49:10	<b>sorts</b> 49:1	strips 28:2	talks 14:14 15:7
14:5 28:8 31:19	50:18 53:1,4,8	Sotomayor 6:4,9	stronger 14:4	34:19
31:19 32:1,3	54:4,5,11 55:11	6:15,18 7:12,15	strongly 52:10	tax 4:24,25 5:12
33:11 46:12	<b>share</b> 5:10	7:20,23 8:6,17	structure 27:21	5:17,20,23,24
55:21	<b>shave</b> 35:14,17	19:7,16,19,22	<b>study</b> 12:9	6:10,24 7:1,7,9
sense 6:19,19	36:3	20:2,7,20,23	<b>subject</b> 9:25 10:6	8:2,8,9,22 9:8
14:3,4 25:15	<b>shed</b> 34:14	21:5,8,11 37:4	27:18	9:13,14 10:17

				01
11:1 20:4,9,14	38:17,25 39:15	21:18 26:15	turns 33:8 45:13	
21:20 22:5,13	39:25 40:3,12	27:7 30:20	two 26:14 27:20	v 1:5 3:4
22:18 23:8,16	41:4,4 44:16,19	40:10 49:14,20	29:1 41:1,19	value 32:5 56:2
24:25 27:17	45:8 46:3 47:1	50:4 51:4,25	49:24 52:9,24	vanishingly
28:5,11 29:13	49:2,4 54:13,15	tinkering 15:13	<b>type</b> 29:13 44:19	32:15
29:14 30:10,18	54:17,22	title 7:18 22:3	47:1 49:5 52:12	view 30:20
30:23 31:1	taxing 12:22	today 12:14	typical 10:4	
32:18,21 33:7	taxpayer7:5,8	13:12 25:5	29:20	W
33:18,20 37:16	taxpayers 5:17	top 20:18	typically 11:19	<b>wage</b> 37:9,17
37:23 39:7,23	technically 14:6	<b>total</b> 46:19	28:20 48:23	wages 3:22,23
40:22 41:2,17	<b>tell</b> 14:11	totally 6:12	49:9	5:21 9:1 13:25
41:18,19,22,25	tells 18:12	Treasury 40:9		20:14,15 23:10
42:4,9 43:8,12	<b>Tenth</b> 26:7	<b>treat</b> 30:1,9	U	35:10 37:6,16
45:3 47:1 48:14	<b>term</b> 25:10 52:16	33:24 43:5,7,16	<b>Uh-huh</b> 14:20	37:18 49:3,5
48:25 49:6,17	52:17	44:2 54:1	ultimately 9:11	<b>wait</b> 27:1
54:19 55:7,13	terms 28:17	treated 18:25	unaware 20:25	want 14:10 16:5
55:17	36:12	27:19 28:23	uncertainty	26:25 28:20,21
taxable 6:23 7:4	textual 40:24	33:23 42:4,9,14	44:13	29:21
7:17,21 22:2,6	51:16,18 52:10	42:17,22 46:4	undercuts 54:24	wanted 14:6 28:8
22:8,8,9,17	<b>Thank</b> 27:9,11	54:18	understand 8:7	45:18,21,21
23:14,14,18	54:4,5 56:9,11	treatment 28:19	10:17 20:24	wants 50:8 53:19
24:13 32:12	thing 21:23 29:24	45:8 49:6 51:13	40:19 47:12	Washington 1:8
38:15,18 39:17	things 10:12	tripped 38:2	understood 32:2	1:18
39:22 40:19	11:18 35:8	trouble 21:6	Underwriters	wasn't 23:4 40:5
41:3,20 49:24	54:11	<b>true</b> 4:15,18,19	16:22	50:7
taxed 5:1 7:24	<b>think</b> 6:19 14:3	4:20 15:14 24:1	unfortunately	way 5:18 14:9
39:23 41:4	15:9 17:24 20:1	38:14 44:25	14:5	29:12 37:18
taxes 3:11 4:10	25:11 26:6 31:4	48:6 49:10	<b>Unit</b> 6:1	41:6,20,23 42:7
4:19,19,21,21	32:6,14 34:1	trust 13:25	<b>United</b> 1:1,6,12	45:10,16,22,24
4:21,22 5:4,8	35:16,23,24	trustee 9:4,4	3:4 22:3	46:5 51:7 53:14
6:7,8,12,17,21	36:10 40:13	13:14,19 22:19	<b>unpaid</b> 14:13	55:2
6:21 8:13,14,23	46:6 50:18,19	22:19 23:21	15:1,6 16:3	ways 39:2 41:2
8:24 9:3,5,15	50:19 52:9,10	24:8 41:11,16	unsecured 36:6	41:19
9:22 11:11,22	thinking 15:24	<b>try</b> 28:20,21 29:6	untold 15:15,19	weren't 38:15
12:15 13:7,15	thought 11:19	29:23 33:25	untrue 17:3	<b>We'll</b> 3:3
13:25 14:16	31:18 37:6	35:23	upwards 46:20	we're 4:24 30:1
15:22 16:6 18:5	47:14 51:16	<b>trying</b> 20:24	48:15	30:14,17 31:1
18:20,22 19:5	thousands 18:3,3	29:16,16 38:7	urge 19:4	40:18 49:11
20:14 21:9,19	<b>three</b> 32:20	42:7 46:9,12	urging 18:17	we've 18:14
24:10 25:1,7	34:23 35:5	47:16	use 7:10 9:2 46:1	whatsoever
26:1,16,19 31:7	throw46:21 48:5	Tuesday 1:9	uses 9:5 24:25	33:12
31:21,25 33:3	tied21:22	turn 37:2,4	25:10 52:16,17	whoever's 14:8
33:21,22 34:16	time 10:10,13,16	turnaround	55:1	wholly 24:5
34:23 35:5,6,11	10:19,19 12:15	11:23	UX 1:3	<b>win</b> 51:8
35:14 37:9	12:16,17 21:16	turned35:7	<b>U.S.C</b> 13:11	winnings 20:15
	l	l	l ————————————————————————————————————	I

				0
23:11	<b>101</b> 16:13 51:23	54:16 55:22	<b>1986</b> 7:16 33:10	<b>507(a)</b> 16:9
word 15:11,15,16	<b>11</b> 3:15 11:14	<b>1226</b> 14:18,19	42:5	28:15
15:25 16:8 55:1	22:16,25 23:7	16:2,20	<b>1998</b> 44:25 45:2	<b>507(a)(2)</b> 14:14
<b>words</b> 14:9	23:25 24:19	<b>1226(b)(1)</b> 14:13		14:14 15:7,7
work 30:12 37:25	25:23 26:11	14:25 27:25	2	53:10
48:14 54:15	27:5 34:25	43:1 50:25,25	<b>2</b> 10:7 11:13,19	<b>507(a)(8)</b> 18:18
works 33:5 54:23	41:24 42:12	51:13 52:21	12:2 15:8 16:10	56:7
worried 31:4	53:20,24	53:10,15	35:16 36:12	<b>54</b> 2:10
worry 50:16	<b>11a</b> 46:23	<b>1227(a)</b> 51:19	38:6,19,21 39:3	
wouldn't 25:6	<b>11's</b> 15:20	<b>1228</b> 17:8	40:1 54:7	6
49:1	<b>11:03</b> 56:12	<b>13</b> 10:3,7 12:3	<b>2005</b> 12:14 44:4	<b>6</b> 36:13
wound 10:20	1129(a)(9)(A)	17:13 25:23,24	<b>2011</b> 1:9	<b>600</b> 46:18
wrapped 11:20	53:22	26:11,20 34:24	<b>27</b> 2:7	<b>6012(b)(3)</b> 41:8,8
wrench 46:21	<b>12</b> 3:19 7:20 9:17	35:25 36:17	<b>28</b> 13:11	41:10,17
wrong 45:22	10:3,6 12:1,10	37:1 42:13,17	<b>29</b> 1:9	
	17:13 19:10,20	43:1,2 46:11,16		7
X	22:16 23:3	46:20,22,23	3	7 22:24 23:24
<b>x</b> 1:2,7	24:19,20,22	47:12,13,19,21	3 2:4 10:8,14	24:4 25:16,18
<b>XI</b> 22:3	25:23 26:11	48:15,16,24	11:19 12:2	27:6 36:13,13
	27:5,21,21 28:3	49:2,3,8,12,16	36:12 51:11	41:23
Y	28:13 29:2	49:21,25 53:21	<b>3-year</b> 11:13	<b>700</b> 46:19
<b>year</b> 10:5,7,8,14	31:10 33:3,7	53:24 55:5	<b>346</b> 6:5,6 7:6	8
12:3 17:13	34:24 35:24	<b>1305</b> 25:25 26:5	33:16 38:16,20	
18:22,23 32:12	36:11,16 37:1	26:8 46:2,7,22	38:22 39:14,24	<b>8</b> 36:13 49:14
46:19,21 56:4	42:3,5,13,17	54:25	40:10	9
<b>years</b> 11:19 12:2	43:1 46:19	1305(a)(1) 46:24	<b>346(b)</b> 6:9,13,20	90 49:25
38:6,7,19 39:4	49:13,23 50:12	47:7 48:3,9	37:24	<b>960</b> 13:12
40:1 44:4	52:3,6 53:21,24	<b>1326(b)(1)</b> 43:1	4	700 13.12
year-of-filing	55:14,24	<b>1398</b> 22:24,24		
19:5	<b>1207</b> 24:22	33:17 37:24	4 36:13 38:7	
ф	<b>1220</b> 14:17	40:18	49:12 50:2	
\$	1220(a)(2)(A)	<b>1399</b> 7:1 22:1	<b>400,000</b> 46:20	
<b>\$29,000</b> 30:24,25	33:4,12	23:7 33:17	48:16	
54:12,13,16	<b>1222</b> 32:25 46:1	37:24 40:18	<b>45</b> 50:1	
<b>\$960,000</b> 30:22	1222(a) 15:2	<b>14a</b> 41:10	5	
30:25	17:5	<b>15</b> 26:13	<b>5</b> 16:2 36:13	
1	1222(a)(2) 27:18	15th 26:14	5 10:2 30:13 5-year 51:11	
1 10:5,5 12:3	28:14 32:2	16a 45:1	5-year 51:11 503 14:15,15	
16:9,10 18:25	36:19 50:24	<b>18</b> 31:14	15:21 17:10	
35:16 36:12	51:7,8,8 52:11	18a 45:1	34:17	
1a 51:24	1222(a)(2)(A)	<b>1966</b> 13:3	<b>503(b)</b> 33:16	
<b>10a</b> 32:17,20	3:13 19:14	<b>1972</b> 39:20 40:9	503(b) (1)(A)	
51:1,3,19	20:12 28:1	<b>1978</b> 33:9 38:24	34:7	
<b>10-875</b> 1:4 3:4	31:23 32:5	39:6,19,24 40:1	<b>507</b> 15:22 19:15	
	43:21 46:14	<b>1980</b> 33:10 40:2		
<b>10:03</b> 1:13 3:2	75.21 70.17	1700 33.10 40.2	52:12	